DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 390 FL 001 915

AUTHOR	Bicknese, Gunther
TITLE	Juniors in Germany: Effects and Opinions. An Experimental Evaluation Through Student Polls.
NOTE	111p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Cultural Awareness, *Cultural Exchange, *German, *Language Instruction, Program Evaluation, Second Language Learning, Social Integration, Social Values, Sociocultural Patterns, Student Adjustment, Student Attitudes, Student Behavior, Student Exchange Programs, Student Opinion, *Study Abroad, *Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS	*Germany

ABSTRACT

This report is based on three separate evaluative surveys. The first compares students' attitudes and opinions before and after the junior year abroad in several areas: (1) attitude toward Germany; (2) integration patterns; (3) religion; (4) politics; (5) the use of tobacco and alcohol, and sexual morality; (6) culture; (7) comparison of university systems and students; and (8) fraternities. Another more subjective program evaluation poll includes: (1) program effects on the individual, (2) organizational aspects of the Marburg program, (3) travel and its impact, (4) health and diet, and (5) academic aspects of the program. An extensive follow-up survey examines the problem of readjustment to the American culture. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (RL)

ED0 42390

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST
AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

JUNIORS IN GERMANY: EFFECTS AND OPINIONS

AN EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION THROUGH STUDENT POLLS

Gunther Bicknese

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST
AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

FL 001 915

ED0 42390

JUNIORS IN GERMANY: EFFECTS AND OPINIONS--AN EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION THROUGH STUDENT POLLS

The report is based on three separate evaluative surveys:

1) a questionnaire comparing the students' attitudes and opinions shortly after their arrival in Germany with those immediately before their return to the United States. In this evaluation psychological methods were employed in testing the students in order to achieve rather objective statistical results.

2) a subjective poll taken at the end of the students' junior-year abroad. Here the juniors were given the opportunity to voice their opinions on the host country, its educational system, and the organization of their study-abroad program.

3) a "follow-up" questionnaire investigating, a year later, the returnees' views of their educational experience abroad and the problem of re-adjustment to the American scene.

The material used in this study represents the accumulated results of the research conducted during three subsequent years with the Millersville Junior Year at Marburg, generally without an attempt to interpret the findings. The manuscript is 108 pages long (double spaced).

Gunther Bicknese
Agnes Scott College
Decatur, Georgia 30030

POOR ORIGINAL COPY-BEST
AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

CONTENTS

Methods and Material 1

Comparative Test of Attitudes and Opinions 8

- I. Attitude toward the Host Country 8
- II. Integration into the Society of the Host Country 11
- III. Religion 13
- IV. Politics 15
- V. Views Concerning the Use of Tobacco and Alcohol and Sexual Morality 20
- VI. Culture 24
- VII. Comparison of University Systems and Students 26
- VIII. Fraternities 31

Subjective Program Evaluation Poll 33

- I. Subjective Effects on the Individual 33
- II. Organizational Aspects of the Marburg Program 49
- III. Travel and Its Impact 52
- IV. Health and Diet 54
- V. Academic Aspects of the Program 57

Follow-up Survey 63

Gunther Bicknese
4101 Spartan Lane
Stone Mountain, Ga.
30083

METHODS AND MATERIAL

The Millersville Junior-Year-in-Marburg Program was implemented in 1963, at a time when many American programs for academic credit were being established in Germany and in other European countries. According to a survey of the U.S. Embassy in Bonn, thirty-one American study programs existed in the Federal Republic in the academic year 1963-64. As interest in these programs increased and new ones were rapidly instituted, uneasiness and concern grew among those who were aware of the serious problems arising from this development. It was at this time that Dr. Stephen Freeman of Middlebury College cautioned:

> ...the failure of some colleges to examine their objectives and evaluate the results critically and realistically, the lack of adequate information about the foreign scene and especially the foreign educational systems, the pressure of student demand and sometimes of faculty demand, the duplication of effort, the shoddiness of some attempts, and many other reasons are now creating a situation which in some aspects threatens to become a national educational scandal.[1]

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST
AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

Dr. Freeman's admonition has often been quoted, as has his urgent appeal for research to explore the educational frontier of organized study abroad. In the five years since Undergraduate Study Abroad was first published, his warning has been repeated many times at conventions and forums. It has been reiterated in articles and speeches, but only sporadic attempts have been made to investigate the feasibility of establishing a standard method for the evaluation of study-abroad programs, and these fragmentary endeavors have not yet resulted in substantial analytic or systematic studies. The necessity of working with a new student body every year, the turnover in the faculty, and the complexity of other problems involved have so far made it impossible to prepare the ground for an extensive research project. Our institutions seem to be farther than ever from an agreement on concrete criteria for the evaluation of existing foreign study programs, which could be utilized in establishing new ones. The discussion goes on, or rather starts anew, at almost every convention. The topic of program evaluation appears on many an agenda, but so long as the basic problems have not been studied, attempts to find and formulate universal standards are doomed. Such an objective can be achieved only by basic and consistent research, conducted by junior-year-abroad programs with relatively few fluctuations. They alone may hope for significant findings that could eventually point the way toward common guidelines.

When Millersville State College asked me to serve as the first resident director of the Junior-Year-in-Marburg, I realized that this new program, if properly observed and logged from the very beginning, could furnish a wealth of information. Having been an exchange student from Germany in the United States over ten years ago, I well remembered the impact that my stay in America and my studies at an American university had made on me. It seemed reasonable that a young American spending a year in Germany would undergo experiences similar to mine. I was aware of the fact that a young individual going abroad in order to study at a foreign university is, no matter how great his interest in academic matters, first of all, a human being. As such he must come to terms with a new environment which, in the course of nine to twelve months, will undoubtedly leave its mark. This, I concluded, was the simple, but necessary basis of all investigations. Consequently the changes in attitude, which most pronouncedly reflect the general effect of the junior-year abroad on the student's personality, had to be measured and evaluated first. The influence of the foreign academic scene and his opinions about it would have to be the object of a secondary, although in part simultaneous, study.

In order to learn more about the methods used by the modern sciences in assessing the human mind, I consulted with the Institute of Psychology at the University of Marburg, but soon realized that the project I proposed, although of some interest to the Institute, would not find the active support I had hoped for -- the Institute was engaged in entirely different branches of research at that time. It offered, nevertheless, constructive advice in regard to the technical procedure of the testing. It was therefore decided to employ, first of all, a questionnaire comparing the students' opinions a few days after their arrival in Germany with those shortly before their return to the United States. In this study, psychological testing methods were used in an attempt to register the various influences of the environment on the young Americans by measuring their reactions to it. Other questionnaires were geared to the student's perception of the world around him and his comparison of the host country with his native land. Portions of these questionnaires aimed at tabulating the student's opinion of his new academic surroundings in general and of his own Junior Year in particular. Since the first Junior-Year group was scheduled to arrive in Marburg only a few days after my first conference with the Institute of Psychology, we were pressed for time but succeeded in drafting several forms for polling and testing the American students.

With only minor alterations, the same set of questionnaires was used in three successive years (1963-1966), henceforth designated as Year or Group I (1963-1964), II (1964-1965), and III (1965-1966). During these three years the basic structure of the academic study program remained virtually unchanged. The student enrollment was nineteen in Year I, nineteen in Year II, and twenty-three in Year III. The student bodies were recruited from the same geographical area (mainly Pennsylvania and other states in the eastern

U.S.) and from colleges of a similar size and type (predominantly small liberal arts and teachers' colleges). There was practically no turnover in the faculty working with the Program, and I served as resident director in Marburg for the entire period covered by this study.

The material used in this investigation consists of: 1) One questionnaire containing seventy questions, which was distributed both at the beginning and at the end of each academic year. Some questions in this form attempt to shed light on the student's personality at the time of the two questionings and to bring to the surface psychological changes in him that were produced by his stay in Germany. Others seek to determine whether the student's views on certain pertinent aspects of daily life had broadened or shifted in focus during his year in Marburg. In Year I, students gave their names; from Year II on, complete anonymity of the tested persons was assured by the use of symbols instead of names. In order to avoid leading the students, all questions were presented in a random sequence. Answers were x-marked on a line with "YES" on one and "NO" on the other end. The juniors were asked to check the point on the line which corresponded most closely with their own opinions.

Examples:

Full approval:	YES-X------------------NO
More Yes than NO:	YES-----X--------------NO
Undecided:	YES----------X---------NO
More NO than YES:	YES--------------X-----NO
Complete disapproval:	YES------------------X-NO

After they had entered their responses, these were evaluated on the basis of a five point division of the scale, extending from "YES" at 1 to "NO" at 5.

YES ----------------------- NO
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

The results of the three years under consideration have been computed and, using the "t-test,"[2] the relative significance of each reply has been established separately for each academic year.

2) A questionnaire with eighty questions, which was given to the participants shortly before their departure from Marburg. The questions of this series are quite varied in their structure, ranging from those requiring only a check-mark answer to those requiring essay-type responses. Some of the questions relate to the same issues investigated in the comparative study; most of the items, however, refer to very practical and specific matters concerning the Junior-Year-Abroad Program.

3) Informal surveys, conducted between nine and ten months after the students' return to America, concerning their own evaluation of the Study-Abroad Program. These surveys consisted of discussion questions, intending to register not only the former juniors' present attitudes and opinions, but also their retention of language skills and of factual knowledge, long range personality changes and career outlooks.

4) Supplementary material

a) Student semester reports in the form of short essays submitted at the end of each semester. Their purpose was to summarize each student's non-academic, as well as his academic, activities. Participants were encouraged to scrutinize their experiences critically rather than merely to enumerate them.

b) Standard test forms previously used in sociological studies of ethnic groups, in an attempt to supplement the main investigations listed above. The result was useful only in a negative sense as it showed that such investigations have no pertinence when applied to an academic group.

c) A tape-recorded group discussion which tock place a few days after the arrival of the first group and a special questioning referring to a problem limited to Marburg (see footnote No.6) proved to be valuable as an additional source of more or less marginal information.

COMPARATIVE TEST OF ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS

I. Attitude toward the Host Country

The great majority of the students questioned had never been to Europe before, but each one had obviously formed an opinion about the Old World based on expectations or preconceptions vaguely derived from the news media. One of the major objectives of this study was to determine the nature, extent, and intensity of such preconceptions and then to observe and measure the changes effected by a one-year stay in Germany.

The question "Is the majority of the German people chauvinistic?" resulted in a striking shift of opinion in all three years.. The medians of the fifty-eight recorded answers registered at first between 2.50 and 3.00, which indicates that the participants were, on the whole, undecided when they came to Marburg. At the end of the year abroad the cumulative median for the three groups combined reached 3.71, a distinctly negative reply. Computed separately for each individual group, these changes were on a very significant[3] level in Years I and II and even registered extremely significant in Year III.

"Do you believe that Nazism was caused by the German 'national character' rather than a 'constellation' of unfortunate circumstances?" The responses demonstrate the students' initial general tendency to blame circumstances for the Third Reich. This conviction had become slightly stronger at the end of each academic year (significant in Year III only: 3.91->4.50).

"Do you believe that the average German family is patriarchal?" The answers of the Marburg juniors supported this widespread belief, both on their arrival and prior to their departure, although the three-year medians with 2.03 at the first and 1.87 at the second testing registered only a rather hesitant "yes." Only Group II showed a strengthening of its previous opinion at the end of the year (very significant: 1.89->1.28).

"Is the average German friendly and hospitable toward Americans?" On this matter the students remained basically undecided throughout the year with a slight tendency toward the positive side. Only Group II showed a very definite shift into the "yes" section of the scale; their "yes" changed from an almost "undecided" 2.00 to an extremely significant 1.22. The result obtained from this question corresponds almost to the decimal point to that from another question appearing on a different page of the same set. The wording was identical, except that the phrase "toward Americans" was omitted. This question can be counted only as a control question, since the students can naturally be expected to have been subjective enough to interpret the question with reference to themselves as Americans.

"Is there a great difference between Americans and Germans?" The change of opinion that became evident at the end of the academic year received a very significant rating with Group II only (3.61 → 2.94). Strangely enough, the difference between Germans and Americans, which had at first been expected to be fairly small, was considered somewhat greater upon termination of the program. The cumulative median remains, however, clearly on the "no" side of the line.

"Do you like the Germans?" attempts to determine the students' reactions to the opinions they expressed in reply to the two previous questions. It appeared only in the questionnaires for the last two groups. The cumulative medians of these are a 1.29 and 1.41 "yes," respectively, showing a minor (.12) shift toward "undecided", which does not register in the significance test. A comparison of this result with the opinions expressed more elaborately in other questionnaires (especially in the ones submitted ten months after the students' return to America) proves rather revealing (see below).

"Are most Americans 'softies'?" met with indecision by all three groups when they arrived in Germany. "Are most Americans 'softies' in comparison with the Germans?" was the corresponding question at the end of the year. Two Groups (I and II) had, in the course of their stay in Europe, discovered (extremely significant) that America is by no means the only nation that has been spoiled by modern civilization: all responses had moved into the clear "no" section of the scale (Group II: 2.50 -> 4.06; Group III 2.64 -> 3.91).

II. Integration into the Society of the Host Country

"Do you intend to participate in many extra-curricular activities here?" the students were asked after their arrival in Germany. In the second questioning, shortly before they left Europe, the wording was changed to, "Did you participate in many extra-curricular activities here?" Although this question does not ask for an opinion or attitude, the result certainly helps to interpret the subsequent questions referring to the integration of the young Americans into the host society. Only Group I seems to have participated in more extra-curricular activities than they had intended to (this group was much more socially oriented than Groups II and III; this, incidentally, could also be seen in their somewhat lower academic achievements). In Years II and III there was a decided and extremely significant gap between previous expectations and reality (II: 2.17 -> 3.39; III: 2.77 -> 3.95). The non-academic sphere appears to have failed to provide the diversions they had hoped to find.

"Were there too many social events at your home college that made it difficult for you to get your work done?" (first questioning) and "Were there too many social events at Marburg that made it difficult for you to get your work done?" (second questioning). Since these two questions refer to two countries and since each question appeared only in either the first or second test, the answers do not disclose a change of opinion, but make it possible to compare the degrees to which - according to the students - social events interfere with studying in the two university systems. The replies of Groups II and III show similar results; neither of these groups felt that the diversions in Marburg had been numerous enough to distract them from their academic obligations (Group II: 4.61, Group III: 3.86). This they reported, although much less emphatically, also to be true of their home colleges (Group II: 3.72, Group III 2.64). The participants in Year I once again revealed the somewhat unusual character of their group: they found the social events at home just a fraction less disturbing than those at Marburg (home: 4.29, Marburg 4.00).

"If you had to choose a roommate at Marburg, would you prefer a German to an American student?" In all three years of testing the students would have preferred a German roommate. A very significant change within the "yes" half of the scale is reported only for Year III (1.18 → 1.77), which, like Year II (no significance rating here), at the end of the year no longer considered it quite so important to share a room with a German. In Year I the students' opinion developed in the opposite direction: more than at the beginning of the academic year they desired a German roommate (no significance rating).

"Do you think it at all possible that you will get married or engaged to a German while living over here?" (first questioning) and "Do you think it at all possible that you would get married to a German if you were to stay here for another year?"(second questioning) These questions were approached rather reluctantly by all students. Although all the marks at first appeared in the "no" section of the scale, they moved quite near the center point at the second questioning. Changes in Groups I (3.88->3.22) and III (4.36->2.91) reached significant and extremely significant ratings, respectively. The third group requires an additional comment. Fourteen of the twenty-two tested participants (the original enrollment mas twenty-three) were girls. The female members of this group were even more hesitant at first than the men and hardly considered it possible that they would marry a German. The comparative scale shows a radical change, with eight of the girls who had recorded answers in the immediate vicinity of the "no" mark later reporting their willingness to marry a German by registering a decided "yes" in the second questioning. Five of them did not change their opinion, and only one moved from the "undecided" to the "no" mark. Among the boys the findings show fewer and less radical changes but still reflect what seem to be widely differing individual, and rather personal, experiences.

III. Religion

It seemed very important to investigate the religious views of the American students, since they were brought up in a country which in general clings more closely to its religious traditions than do many European countries. Of the three questions concerning religion, two, controlling each other, can be considered jointly.

"Are Americans more religious than Germans?" and "Are

Germans less religious than Americans?" These are separate questions; each was asked at the first as well as at the second questioning. The results are compatible. The medians of the two questions changed from 3.12 and 3.25 in the beginning--a clear indication that our students were not aware of the diminishing religiousness of Germans when they arrived--to a rather low 2.23 and 2.18 before they returned to the United States. In both Groups I and II the results were extremely significant.

"Since fewer people go to church in Germany, do you think they are more honest than the average American churchgoer?" brought significant findings only in Year II (2.28 -> 3.11). According to all participants, however, the American churchgoer is no less honest than the average German who no longer goes to church regularly: all replies are a moderate "no", increasingly so at the end of the year (three-year medians: 2.77 -> 3.11).

IV. Politics

In all three years under study most of the students had at best a superficial knowledge of the political scene in West Germany. Many of the questions used in this area are intended to compare attitudes or opinions; others aim at measuring the factual knowledge the students gained within the year. It is difficult, however, to draw a clear-cut line between these two objectives, for all participants were subjected to a broad variety of outside influences, such as the news media, their teachers, and their fellow students. It should be noted that the resident director conducted a special Junior-Year course dealing with contemporary Germany and emphasizing current political and social problems. The students were necessarily influenced in this course not only by leading newspapers and magazines, which served as textbooks, but also by the viewpoints and opinions expressed by their teacher.

The questions which follow represent a selection of those that yielded especially relevant student responses:

"Do you consider Adenauer one of Germany's greatest statesmen?" The second questioning showed a shift from a hesitant "yes" to a decided "no." It is extremely significant only in Years II and III (1.82->2.94 and 2.09->3.59, respectively). Adenauer's image in the United States, unlike that in Germany, has consistently been that of a great statesman, a fact which is obviously reflected by the students' positive attitude upon their arrival in Germany. Although Adenauer stepped down in the fall of 1963 following massive attacks, mainly from German intellectuals, strong criticism continued in 1964-65, when the ex-chancellor was still active in politics and stubbornly clung to his hard-line policies in a thawing cold war.[4]

"Do you think that Chancellor Erhard deserves the support of the German people?" The responses experienced an extremely significant change from "yes" (1.82) to "no" (3.00) in Year III. This strong denunciation of Erhard, whose lack of political strength had since become evident, parallels the negative attitude toward Adenauer (Erhard was forced to resign in the fall of 1966).

"Do you believe Germany's SPD is breaking with Marxist ideology?" The deviation of the answers tabulated in the second polling, extremely significant in Year III (3.05→1.18) and very significant in Year II (2.83→1.83), indicates that the students "did their homework." The trend to a clear "yes" shows that they studied the press reports and took note of the public discussions on internal changes in the Social Democratic Party.

"Do you believe that a victory of the SPD over the CDU would be desirable?" In the first two years after the implementation of the Junior-Year program--during Erhard's chancellorship--the weakness of the ruling Christian Democratic Party became obvious, and there was great demand for a change, again most eloquently proclaimed by students and other intellectuals. Academic year Groups II and III once more proved their keen interest in politics by registering extremely significant changes from "no" to "yes" (two-group medians: 3.11→2.61). When they first arrived in Germany they in all probability interpreted the term "Social Democratic" as a synonym of socialist, i.e. akin to communist (as is still true for many Americans), and it can safely be assumed that the revision of their opinion was caused not only by discussing the issues with their German contemporaries, but also by reading the press reports about the reformist tendencies in the SPD (see the preceding question).

"Do you think it possible that in the case of a war between America and Russia the SPD would sympathize with the Russians?" The gradual progress in the SPD, and its turning away from orignial Marxist theories, is reflected in the students' answers, which were marked in the "no" section of the scale in all three years and became a more decided "no" at the end of each year (three-year medians 3.60→4.41). There was no significance in Year I, while both Years II and III registered "extremely significant." All but six of the twenty-two students tested in the third group indicated an emphatic "no" on the questionnaire.

"From your observations, is the average German cured of Hitler?" Even though there is no change of statistical significance to report, the fact that the cumulative medians for all three years under observation indicate only a slight "yes" response in both tests (2.03→2.11) suggests that the average American student was as skeptical in this respect when he left as he had been at his arrival.

"Do you know any important reason why a reunited Germany might not be desirable?" The replies to this question are of special interest in that they show a change from "undecided" to "no" in Year I (2.56→3.16) and from "no" to "undecided" in Year III (3.48→2.50), the former being significant and the latter extremely significant. The differences in the points of view expressed by the Americans may be attributed to the different composition of their groups and/or to the growing anti-militarism and pacifism among their German contemporaries.

"*In your opinion, would most Americans prefer a reunification of Germany?*" In all three years the students' opinions at the end of the study program differed only slightly from those they had had at the beginning (three-year medians 1.97 →2.46). Significant (very) only in Year II, all of them moved somewhat toward "no", although the median still indicates a slight overall "yes" response. It is unlikely that the participants had discussed this question with their American friends in their correspondence and it appears equally improbable that they were influenced by American news media. The change, therefore, must be interpreted as a change in the persons questioned rather than in the American public, whose opinion they were asked to record. Experience has shown that after about six months American students are integrated into their new environment to such a degree that they feel qualified to judge their host nation as critically as if they were natives of this country. With the disappearence of initial inhibitions, the responses to the second questioning seem to reflect the students' true opinions.

"*Do you agree with the American policy on Berlin?*" When they arrived in Germany, all three groups were generally in favor of Washington's actions in and for Berlin (three-year median 1.91→2.34). Upon termination of the Junior-Year Program only the median of Group I, with a 2.61 reading, indicates an extremely significant step across the undecided mark to the "no" side. In the two other years, the median answers remained "yes", but moved toward the center of the line. As the situation in Berlin after the erection of the wall slowly normalized, the American students saw less reason to disagree with the American Berlin policy. All groups visited the former German capital and made personal contacts in East Berlin. The change found in Group I is of extreme statistical significance, but this can probably be attributed to the fact that the wall was relatively young and the economic status of the city still rather poor. The contacts with Berliners which this group had previously established made it possible for the students to visit in the homes of workers, and their semester reports show that these experiences left an even deeper impression than the discussion with East Berlin students arranged in the latter two years for Groups II and III.

V. Views Concerning the Use of Tobacco and Alcohol and Sexual Morality

Questions in this category seek to investigate the students' attitudes in regard to certain moral issues. It was to be expected that a year of immersion in a society in which puritan traditions are practically non-existent and in which the nineteenth century "Wilhelminian" thinking has long been replaced by liberal, unconventional trends would leave observable traces. It is also understandable that the young Americans, many of whom experienced independence from their parents or student deans for the first time in their lives, would not only enjoy this freedom so unfamiliar to them, but also, at least occasionally, misuse it.

Little or no insight was gained from the question "Do you think smoking is bad in itself?" Most students had not known any restrictions in their use of tobacco at home, and the three-year average mark is, at the beginning as well as at the end, somewhat on the negative side of the scale (2.88→2.97).

Only very slight changes appeared in their responses to a parallel question referring to alcohol: at the end of the Junior-Year Program the marks were almost without exception in the extreme "no" section of the scale as they had been at the first questioning (4.66→4.78). Other related questions, however, reveal that there was a change in the students' overall attitude toward alcoholic beverages. The replies to the following question, for instance, are worthy of note:

"Should beer vending machines be placed on American college campuses?" There are beer vending machines in most of the university-controlled dormitories in Marburg, and students have free access to them at all times. When they arrived, the American juniors voted against the introduction of such machines on American campuses (three-year median 3.56) They came, however, very close to favoring these machines before their departure (2.53). A significant change to "yes" was registered in Year I (3.11→2.27) and an extremely significant reversal from "no" to "yes" (3.86→2.14) was noted in Group III (this is especially remarkable since the ratio between females and males tested in this group was fourteen to eight). The results in Year II (3.72→3.17) did not rate "significant."

Even though no significance was recorded, average answers to the question "Can you hold your liquor?" show that the participants became more accustomed to consuming alcoholic beverages (three-year median 2.19→2.02), and the majority of them (again without statistical significance) considered it desirable to teach Americans "how to drink more moderately rather than to abstain" (2.14→2.04).

Questions concerning the students' relationship with members of the opposite sex brought more informative findings than those concerning the use of tobacco and alcohol.

"Do you think that American girls are over-protected?" The three-year median, a 2.79 "no" in the beginning, shows a unanimous shift to a 1.68 "yes", significant in Groups I and III and extremely significant in Year II. The extremely significant rating in Year II must be attributed mainly to a radical change of opinion among the men. A separate evaluation of the replies by sexes established a 1.66 deviation for the boys and a 0.78 for the girls, indicating very clearly that their stay in Germany caused most of the men to reevaluate their opinions about the liberty permitted American girls.

"Do you insist that the boy or girl you marry has never been intimate with someone else?" Group III answered "no" (4.18) to this question almost unanimously shortly after their arrival in Europe, and there is virtually no change to be reported at the end of the year (4.27). That the girls represent the majority in this group may account for this reading; they seem to be willing to grant their future husbands more freedom than the young men would allow their brides-to-be. A change that resulted in Group I is the only one receiving an extremely significant rating. Strangely enough, in this case the boys took a more decided step toward liberal views in matters of sex than did the girls (a change of 0.88 versus 0.55).

"Are you against premarital relations?" The three-year median for the first questioning was 2.69, a mere 0.19 in the "no" section of the scale. In the second questioning, however, it increased to 3.9, a very strong "no". Looking again separately at the two sexes, both men and women of Group I made equal strides (o.78) toward the absolute "no" mark. In Year II the males were overtaken by the females, 0.89 to 1.44, and in Year III (N.B.: the ratio between the males and females tested was eight to fourteen; in Years I and II sex distribution had been equal), the girls arrived at a 4.43 "no" -- leading in the change by 2.08 points as compared to only 0.75 points among the males. This startling result calls for no further comments.

Group III was consistent in the practical demands growing out of their liberal attitude specified in the preceding question. "In view of the fact that you are an adult, would you consider it sound if dormitories had no specified visiting hours?" The significance of the change from "no" to "yes" was extreme in Year III (3.09→1.60). A similar reversal from "no" to "yes" (3.22→2.39) rated significant in Year II, while in Year I, the answer receded from a weak "no" to the neutral point of 2.50. The median for all three years also indicates a divergence from "no" to "yes" (2.81→2.19). "Are you in favor of coeducational dormitories, similar to hotels?" brought almost identical results, although with a slightly lower significance rating.

In conclusion, this study seems to prove that confronting American students with the different views on sexual morality that exist in Germany (it is very likely that results would be similar in other European countries) creates problems and brings about major changes in the attitudes of young people. The interpretation of these changes vary widely, but no matter whether one considers the liberalization of the students' thinking positively or negatively, the problems connected with it are serious and deserve extremely careful consideration.

VI. Culture

Any attempt to measure a person's appreciation of cultural values will produce but dubious results. I am therefore including in this study only three questions on this issue. They seek to determine changes in our students' attitudes toward music and the theater. The more subjective investigations below (see the findings under Subjective Program Evaluation Poll and Follow-up Survey, pp. 42f. and 63ff.) will shed more light on the subject matter.

One question comparing intention and realization indicates that the high hopes for cultural nourishment which the participants held when they arrived in Europe were not satisfied. The wording at the beginning of the academic year was, "Do you intend to go to concerts of classical music as often as possible during your stay in Germany?" This was followed up by, "Did you go to concerts of classical music as often as possible during your stay in Germany?" The three-year median shows that the expectations or intentions of the average student were not fulfilled; indeed, the shift was from 1.49 on the affirmative side to 2.94 in the negative half. An extremely significant rating is recorded in Year III, with a divergence to 3.32 from a hopeful 1.64.

The overall rating of the question "Do you like to see plays and operas?" indicates that the young Americans' taste did not experience a radical change during their stay in Germany. Significant tabulations were made only in Years I and II (significant and very significant, respectively), but strangely enough, they were diametrically opposed: in Year I the enjoyment of cultural offerings diminished somewhat (1.22->1.38); the small degree to which the answer marks of the individual students moved toward the center of the scale was almost equal for all group members. The fact that in Group II a rather inconspicuous shift of the responses in the direction of the "yes" mark (1.44->1.06) received the rating "very significant," indicates that in this year, too, the reported change of opinion--though reverse from that of Year I--was nearly uniform in direction and intensity with virtually all participants.

"Do you like rock'n'roll - at least occasionally?" A comparison of the students' cultural appreciation with their interest in dance music reveals that they appreciated the essentially entertaining qualities of modern dance music more at the end of the academic year (1.70) than in the beginning (2.08). Most of the students liked rock'n'roll when they first arrived, and Group I reached a very significant rating at the end, with a shift from a very nearly "undecided" 2.44 to an indubitable "yes" at 1.72.

VII. Comparison of University Systems and Students

Rather than letting the American students guess about the effectiveness of the German lecture system before experiencing it, a question was posed that aims at a comparison between the American and German university systems. At the beginning the participants were asked, "Does the course system at American colleges force the students to 'cram' rather than to concentrate on independent research?" This question was later followed by, "Does the German lecture system give students a better chance for independent research than the American course system does?" The cumulative medians of both questions are almost identical: a relatively strong "yes" (1.51 and 1.64). This, I believe, does not necessarily indicate that the American students consideredthe German universities better than the American institutions from which they came. It does, however, show their preference for the German system at the time of testing. In evaluating these data, one should not forget: (a) the juniors sent to Marburg were a select group and came better qualified for independent study than most other American undergraduates; (b) some of them did not realize that the greater freedom they enjoyed was expected to be matched by more responsibility.

Implicit in the question, "Is the European lecture system conducive to studying more intensively than the American course system?" is the challenge to rate both systems according to quality rather than to indicate a preference for either one. The median answer of the three-year period, originally a weak "no" (2.65), became a very strong "no" (3.47) at the end of the questioning periods. This change reads significant (very) only in Year I (1.94→3.77). Here, apparently contradicting the earlier responses, all three groups spoke in favor of the American course system, probably because it places a greater emphasis upon the individual student's diligence.

"Do you believe that you will prefer the non-existence of a campus in Marburg which forces you to live more or less privately?" (first questioning) and "Did you prefer the non-existence of a campus in Marburg which forced you to live more or less privately?" (second questioning) Although I expected unequivocal and basically uniform answers to this question, answer marks in all three years were so scattered that only Year III records a significant (very) change from a 3.59 "no" to a 2.23 "yes." An insignificant change was reported from a 1.72 "yes" in Year II to a 2.56 "no." The cumulative result of all three years showed a relatively minor shift from the "undecided" mark to a weak "yes" (2.49→2.22). Individual differences among the students' preferences may account for this outcome; the significance of Year III was undoubtedly caused by the female majority in the group, which was relatively timid at the beginning of the study program and became more courageous in the course of the year.

"Is the German 'Gymnasium' scholastically superior to the American high school?" The American students had previously learned of the good quality of the secondary schools in Germany which are still based on the elite system. Their year abroad confirmed this opinion. Initial and final responses were in the "yes" half of the scale, and there was virtually no difference between the two cumulative means (1.65→1.63).

"*Do you think most German students are more mature than American undergraduates?*" Only participants in Years II and III were asked this question. Both groups knew before going abroad that their German counterparts would be older than they; their median answers at the beginning of the academic year correspond to this knowledge: a 1.74 "yes" is listed. Replies at the end of their stay abroad moved a little closer to the neutral mark of the scale (1.96), which may indicate that the students had gained more confidence in themselves. Deviations reported did not rate "significant."

Changes seen in the answers to another question, however, received an extremely significant rating in two years and a very significant rating with the third group. When first asked the question, "*Do you think that German students work harder than American students?*" the juniors in Year I, polling a strong "yes" (1.50), apparently highly overestimated the diligence of German students, but altered this opinion markedly, as is reflected in the decided "no" (3.05) of the second questioning. Similar results, although not quite so emphatic, are seen in Group II (2.28 → 3.33) and Group III (2.23 → 3.68).

"*Do you sometimes think that the average German student knows 'so much more' than you?*" For none of the groups can a significant change of opinion be reported. The three-year medians show a minor shift from 2.11 to 2.08 and hint that the average Marburg junior did not deny the superiority of the native students, but considered his knowledge to be only slightly inferior to that of his German counterparts. As the replies to the preceding question prove, our juniors did not attribute the Germans' superiority to their work habits: according to the American visitors, German students do not work as hard as American students. The explanation may be found in the Germans' better general education, especially at the high school level (see above, p. 27).

"Do you expect German students to show a snobbish attitude toward you?" (first questioning) and "Did many German students show a snobbish attitude toward you?" (second questioning). The change from a decided "no" (3.69) to an even stronger "no" (4.00) bears no significance rating, but proves that the hopes and expectations of our students were not disappointed. The problem of integration into the academic world of the German university will be discussed again in another section of this study.

"Are German students generally provincial and narrow-minded?" Our juniors held their German contemporaries in high esteem when they arrived : they attested to their broad-mindedness by polling a strong "no" (3.67) to the above question. They learned to respect them even more during their year's stay in Marburg, which is indicated by a cumulative median of 4.00 at the second questioning. Group I recorded an extremely significant change from 3.39 to 4.27.

"Are American students more internationally-minded than German students?" According to the initial replies to this question German students are considerably more interested in international affairs (3.72). This opinion prevailed even more pronouncedly at the end of each session (4.08). An extremely significant rating was registered in Year I (3.78→4.33). The cumulative medians for the three years are almost congruent with the individual medians of each separate academic year.

"*Do you think that your German contemporaries are as democratic in their political attitudes as you are*?" If our students did, in fact, change their opinions in regard to this matter, the change is scarcely worth mentioning (2.67→2.76). At both questioning periods the three groups were convinced that German students are almost, if not quite, as democratic in their views as they themselves. The absence of statistical significance and the proximity of the neutral mark of the scale do not warrant an attempt at explanation.

"*In view of the fact that there are many foreign students in Germany, do you expect to find racial discrimination among German students*?" (first questioning) and "....*did you find racial discrimination among German students*?" Coming from a country with definite and serious racial problems, our juniors had expected to find little or no discrimination against students of other races in Marburg, an opinion that may in part have been caused by German press reports which are generally highly critical of existing prejudice in the United States. During their year at Marburg, our students discovered that visiting students of other races are discriminated against in Germany somewhat more frequently than they had expected. The cumulative median remained on the "no" side but diverged from an initial 4.05 to a much weaker 2.88 at the end of the academic year. The findings were very significant in Years I (3.67→2.66) and III(4.14→3.09) and extremely significant in Year II (4.33→2.89).

VIII. Fraternities

In regard to social fraternities (sororities do not exist), Marburg has the reputation of being one of the most conservative universities in Germany.[5] It is estimated that about thirty percent (exact figures are not available) of all male students are members of traditional fraternities, many of which are influenced by right-wing thinking.

"Would you say that members of duelling fraternities are fanatic traditionalists?" Although one of the juniors (in Year I) became a member of a traditional fraternity and others attended fraternity meetings and parties as guests, the three-year median, initially a 3.37 "no", remained virtually unchanged in the final questioning (3.34). A very significant rating was found in Year III, when the originally strong "no" answer (3.45) drifted close to the "undecided" mark (2.68). This result stands in contrast to the trend, however insignificant, toward a stronger "no" in Years I and II.

"Do you consider members of German duelling fraternities immature?" Again a significance rating, this time extreme, was tabulated only in Year III, when the median answer of 3.09 shifted into the "yes" half with a 2.00 reading. The three-year median dropped from a strong 3.14 "no" to an almost "undecided" 2.55. In connection with this question and the immediately preceding ones it must again be pointed out that the majority of Group III consisted of female students.

"Are German conservative fraternities a potential threat to democracy?" The relatively strong 3.28 "no," which became somewhat stronger at the end of the year (3.55), as indicated by the median response, seems to be a logical consequence of the students' opinions registered in the preceding question: since many members of conservative fraternities are immature, their organizations cannot threaten the democratic form of government. No significance is reported, but statistically all three groups tested responded in essentially the same manner.

"Do German conservative fraternities distract their members from studying?" Only Year II shows that our students learned enough about German fraternities to change their negative to a positive standpoint (3.28->2.17: extremely significant). The overall median also changed from a 2.92 "no" to a 2.31 "yes" rating.

The last question in this series makes a direct comparison between conditions in America and in Germany. "Do American fraternities need reforming as much as German fraternities?" The medians for the three years, 2.71->2.89 (none of the individual yearsindicates a significant change) reveal the general consensus: American fraternities are not quite so bad when measured against the traditional German fraternities.

SUBJECTIVE PROGRAM EVALUATION POLL

A questionnaire entitled "Program Evaluation" was distributed among the juniors at the end of their respective academic years together with the follow-up questionnaire of the comparative test. As stated above, this form contained eighty questions of rather diversified structure: some of them required a "yes" or a "no" answer, some a percentage rating, some a numerical estimate, and others a comment. This project did not attempt to tabulate objectively the changes of opinion that occurred in the course of the year, it rather registered the students' own subjective assessments of their standpoints and of the degrees to which these were altered or modified during the preceding ten months. In addition, many of the questions aimed simply at soliciting comments from the students concerning the organization of their Program.

With only occasional modifications, each of the three groups was confronted with the same questions, and most replies can be viewed cumulatively. As in the comparative test, questions originally presented to the students in a random sequence are here organized according to subject matters.

I. Subjective Effects on the Individual

"Has the Program been a success for you personally?" This question elicited a "yes" response from fifty-six students, while two entered "no," and one remained undecided.

"Did the Junior-Year program in general fulfill your expectations?" Fifty-four replied "yes"; two, "no," and two "not sure."

"Does your present proficiency in German not meet, meet, or exceed your expectations?" "Not meet," twenty; "meet," twenty-nine; "exceed," twelve. This apparently rather poor result loses much of its discouraging perspective if one looks at Year I separately: eleven out of the nineteen students were dissatisfied with their proficiency in German. In order to institute the Program, most students in the initial group had been admitted without sufficient consideration of their academic background. One should, therefore, not be startled by the fact that so few of them were satisfied with their progress in the language, and that one of the two best students commented under "General Suggestions," "I think that the most important improvement that could be made is a more careful screening of students according to academic ability."

"How much everyday German do you understand (in percent)?" Group I averaged eighty-eight percent, Groups II and III arrived at ninety percent each.

"Do you speak everyday German with great ease, with ease, or haltingly?" "With great ease," sixteen; "with ease," thirty-eight; and "haltingly," seven (four of whom were from Group I).

"How much academic German do you understand (in percent)?" Group I averaged seventy-six percent, while Groups II and III both agreed on eighty-five percent.

"Do you participate in class discussions with great ease, with ease, or haltingly?" Four answered "with great ease"; twenty-five, "with ease"; and twenty-seven, "haltingly." The largest number (eleven) of those judging themselves as speaking haltingly in such discussions are from Group III, while Group I registered nine, and Group II, seven. This rather unexpected result may be traced to the higher academic demands Group III had set for itself as well as to the greater shyness within this predominantly female group.

"Do you believe that you think in German? If yes, when did you first notice it?" Forty-eight marked the "yes," eleven the "no." On the average, thinking in German was first observed by the students after five or six months of their stay in Germany.

"Do you read German with ease?" Fifty-seven reported "yes," while only two answered "no." "When did you begin to read German with ease?" Most participants noticed it at a time between six and seven months after their arrival in Marburg.

"List up to five books--other than textbooks--which you have read during the year." Books by Brecht, Frisch, Dürrenmatt, Nietzsche, Thomas Mann, Kafka, and Schiller were among those most frequently listed, while other authors mentioned included Böll, Rilke, Spengler, Borchert, Hochhuth, Stifter, Anne Frank, Büchner, the Brothers Grimm, Günter Grass, and Karl Marx.

"Do you get as much pleasure from reading German books as you do from English books?" "Yes," fifty-two, and "no," seven.

In connection with the language skill, the "German-only" rule of the program requires special attention. Beginning in

Year I, all students agreed to speak nothing but German, even among themselves, at all times. In fact, they quite willingly signed a written pledge to that effect. Their self-imposed restriction, however, turned out to be one of the most critical and controversial decisions of the entire study-abroad program. Students were generally enthusiastic about the idea and adhered to it so long as they were energetic enough--which in some cases applied only to the first few days. As resident director, I very frequently discussed this issue with the students, and when we fully realized the fundamental difficulties that the pledge involved, we abandoned it, at least in its written form, in Year II. Students were still required to speak German at all times, but during the remaining two years of my resident-directorship, the "German-only" rule was not enforced vigorously, nor were penalties introduced (as is the case with at least two other programs in Germany). It is revealing to see the students' answers to the questions relating to the "German-only" rule:

"Did you speak English within the group almost always, often, or almost never?"

	All groups combined	Group I only
Almost always	8	4
Often	26	12
Almost never	25	3

As can be seen, the results of Group I deviated considerably from the average results. It is unlikely that this can be ascribed solely to the negative effect of the written pledge.

The established fact that this group was academically weaker than the others may well have been the decisive factor for the students' laxity in their speaking habits.

"At what period during the year did you speak the most English?" The great majority entered "at the end of the year"; some listed "at Christmas time"; a few reported "at the beginning of the year." Some of the reasons cited in the comments were fatigue, frustration, and homesickness.

"Do you believe that the written German-only pledge has helped a great deal, somewhat, or not at all?" was asked in Year I only. Seven replied, "not at all"; twelve, "somewhat"; no one of this group reported that the pledge had helped "a great deal."

After the written pledge was given up, the words "written German-only pledge" in the above question were replaced by "German-only rule," beginning with Year II. Consequently, the following replies in regard to the usefulness of the German-only rule are from Groups II and III only: "Not at all," two; "somewhat," seventeen; "a great deal," twenty-two.

From the failure of the written pledge I concluded that any kind of pledge can only be effective if conveyed psychologically by appealing to the students' reason, and I refrained from reprimanding the offenders, limiting myself to the positive approach. The result was more rewarding, although still far from perfect.

"Did you have more close friends in the group, among German students, or among students from other lands?" Some of the students modified the meaning of the word "close." Since those who made no comments can also be expected to have had various opinions, all of the students' comments were disregarded in the evaluation of the replies. In all three groups thirty-two had more friends among Americans in the group, twenty-seven among Germans, and three juniors preferred students from other lands.

"Did you date not as much, as much, or more than at home?" Twenty-three answered "not as much"; seventeen, "as much"; and twenty, "more." Seventeen of those who had fewer dates than at home, were boys, while thirteen of the girls and only six of the boys reported having more dates than in America. Although it should be noted that female students are in the minority at German universities, age may be a far more important factor: American juniors are considerably younger than most German students, and this obviously put the American boys at a disadvantage.

"How many students do you say 'du' to?" It is well known that the more conventional address ("Sie") is commonly used among German students at the university level. Only very close friends replace it by the familiar "du", usually after a fairly long acquaintance. As a rule, the older person suggests the change to the younger. Since our juniors were among the youngest occupants of the dormitories, it can be assumed that their German counterparts took the initiative in crossing the line. It can, therefore, be considered quite significant that the average Junior-Year student was on the "du" basis with about twenty-two Germans at the end of the year.

"How many German friends have you made with whom you plan to exchange letters?" Among the first group which, as mentioned above, was socially very active, one student planned to remain in touch with as many as twenty-five German "pen-pals," but in the same group there were three who did not intend to correspond with any of their German contemporaries. The average number of letter-friends anticipated by all three groups was about six.

"How many German families have you visited?" Extremes are represented by four students who visited none and four other students who claimed to have been guests of ten or even more German families. The average number of families visited by individual members in all three years was 3.5. If this figure seems low, one must take into account that the population of Marburg in the years 1963 to 1966 was only 48,000 as against a student population of approximately 8,000.

"Were you satisfied with living in a dorm or would you have preferred to live with a family at least for one semester?" Thirty-two were completely satisfied with the arrangements made for them by the Program--they lived in the university-operated dormitories. Thirteen would have preferred a change after one semester, and fourteen, given a choice, would rather have stayed with families from the beginning.

"Were you homesick? If yes, when?" It is understandable that Group I, the socially most active group, had the lowest incidence of homesickness with three, whereas Group III, with its female majority, reached a maximum of nine. For all three years combined, a total of thirty-seven "no's" stands against twenty "yes's." Among the comments by those who admitted to homesickness were, "only when I had love problems;" "at Christmas time," "in the beginning," "shortly before leaving," and "when I was sick."

"Do you think it possible that you would ever choose to live in Germany?" Forty-one replies were affirmative; eighteen were negative. During the three years following these questionings, at least six of the former Marburg students have made, or are planning to make, their permanent home in Germany; at least twenty have returned to Marburg and other German cities for temporary stays.

"Do you feel that you really became a part of the culture of the host country?" Forty-five answered "yes"; fifteen, "no." Comments among those who answered "no" included: "I was always a member of an American group, always reminded of my nationality, considered an 'Ausländerin'"; "Didn't adapt enough, too damn American." The only comment accompanying a positive response was, "Yes, as a connoisseur." Even though the environment of a German university perhaps does not supply the best opportunity for Americans to become familiar with everyday German family life, it provides an almost ideal situation for natural contact with German students and an opportunity for genuine assimilation into university life with its special atmosphere. As the replies to this question suggest, our students had no difficulty in adjusting to the academic and cultural life of the host country and in becoming part of it.

"Have you changed your professional plans?" Fifteen of the sixty students answered "yes" to this question, forty-two answered "no," and three were not sure. The following comment seems to have a certain degree of significance: "Now I have to stick to Germanistics." A student who, before going to Marburg, had apparently planned to become a German teacher wrote: "I realize now I would not be properly prepared to teach German because of lack of real knowledge." The opposite effect of the year abroad is seen in another remark: "Still up in the air, but possibility of teaching for the first time."

"Has the year abroad confirmed your previous professional plans?" Some of the students were uncertain when they arrived in Germany and were equally uncertain when they left. The answer "yes" was checked twenty-eight times, "no" thirty times; two students did not reply at all. There is no sure way of establishing the number of participants in the Marburg year who initially intended to become teachers of German. In order to be accepted by the Program, many of those who were not sure stated on the application form that they were candidates for the teaching profession. The students' semester reports and the follow-up questionnaire (see below), however, justify the assumption that German or related fields came to play a more important part in the professional thinking of many students only at the end of the Marburg year or even during the year following their return to America.

"Did the difference in moral and religious values bring about a change in your own attitudes and opinions?" The tabulation of the "yes" and "no" answers to this question resulted in a near tie: thirty "yes," and twenty-seven "no," and three "undecided." If one compares these data with the ones obtained from questions referring to morals in the first part of this study (see pp. 21-23), the value of the psychological questionnaire becomes more obvious. When asked to judge for himself whether or not his opinions have changed, the polled person generally shows a lack of objectivity. When forced to register his opinions, however, by marking them on a scale, he makes it possible for a neutral statistician to read and evaluate the changes that really occurred.

The few questions of the comparative study referring to the arts (see p. 24f.) furnish no clear indication as to whether or not the students experienced any gains or losses in this field when studying abroad. Concerning this matter, this report must rely on the more subjective results of the "Program Evaluation" questionnaire:

"Have you developed more interest and understanding for the fine arts, the theater, and music?" With regard to the fine arts, fifty-two answered "yes," and only six reported "no." There were two abstentions. "I was interested all along, but increased my knowledge about it," was the only unsolicited comment.

With reference to the theater, fifty students replied "yes," and only six reported "no." Music, which was never included among the Junior-Year special courses, received forty-seven "yes's," ten "no's," and three abstentions.

One question asking the students to list cultural events they had attended during the year drew so many different answers that it would be impossible to list them here. They ranged from visits to the most familiar German and European museums to such international events as the documenta exhibit of modern art, from chamber music, symphony, and opera to jazz, and from Shakespeare and Goethe to Dürrenmatt and Ionesco.

"Where did you gain more academically: in university lectures or in Junior-Year courses?" Only in Year I was the question phrased in this way, and fifteen of this group of nineteen believed the special Junior-Year courses to have been more profitable than the university lectures. In Years II and III the question was rephrased in such a way as to evaluate the two types of courses separately in each of the two semesters. Of Group II, thirteen students assessed the university lectures as more valuable to them in the second semester, twelve considered the Junior-Year courses essential, but only for the first semester; three students subdivided the Junior-Year courses, distinguishing between those offered in the first and second semesters. Only two thought that the Junior-Year courses had altogether been more effective than the university lectures, even in the second semester. Similarly in Year III, the overwhelming majority asserted that, in the beginning, they gained less from the university lectures than from their special courses: fifteen voted in favor of the Junior-Year offerings during the first semester, only four preferring the university lectures, while another four were unable to arrive at a decision. For the second semester the university lectures received seventeen and Junior-Year courses only five favorable votes.

These responses seem to indicate that during the first semester of study at the German university, our American students had acquired sufficient confidence in their linguistic and academic abilities to rate their intellectual gains from the university lectures in the second semester higher than those derived from special courses. These results call for comparison with the findings of the following two questions.

"Do you prefer (a) the German system of working independently or (b) the American way with strict supervision and assignments?" In all three years, thirty-eight students favored the German and only thirteen the American system; eight were undecided. This choice is in agreement with the results obtained from the preceding question. Since in the first semester our students were supplied with tutors for the most difficult lectures and sporadically in the second semester, these lectures were more profitable to them than to many a German student. Pride in their indeed remarkable academic progress may have contributed to their preference in this matter.

"Do you expect to be pleased, satisfied, or dissatisfied with your home college after this year?" Only six replied that they would be pleased, seventeen expected to be satisfied, and thirty-seven to be dissatisfied with their home colleges. It must be stated that these findings cannot be taken as a quality rating of the two university systems. The students' written semester reports suggest a rather critical attitude toward several aspects of the German university system, especially toward its main pillar, the academic lecture. If, in spite of that, they seemed to prefer the German over the American system, their replies on the questionnaire may have been influenced by other factors: their great respect for the intellectual standard of their German fellow-students (who, in accordance with the German educational system, represent an elite); our juniors' immense and usually justified pride in their linguistic and scholastic achievement; last but not least, the almost unlimited academic and social freedom they enjoyed.

"Do you think there were enough or not enough opportunities for extra-curricular discussions with German professors?" Seven participants in Groups I and II and fourteen in Group III entered their marks behind the "not enough." Although the Program arranged some meetings of the groups with German professors, the young Americans still had reason to be frustrated as such communication between teachers and students was the exception rather than the rule. This is a very common phenomenon, however, at all German universities and is, of course, felt more keenly by American undergraduates than by native German students.

"Did you have to study harder in America or Germany?" The majority of all the groups (a total of thirty-six) rated the requirements at their American home colleges as more demanding than those at the German university. A total of eighteen apparently were more industrious in Germany, while six were not sure or modified the question in some way.

- - -

Although the following questions are of the type that is often employed by reporters, i.e. somewhat vague, they shed light on the students' thinking and may help to interpret the replies to some of the more specialized questions.

"What disappointed you most during your year in Marburg with regard to (a) the country and (b) the people?" Among the negative aspects mentioned concerning the country were the bad weather, the Americanization of German cities, the sometimes low quality of the food, and inadequate health facilities. Regarding the people, the following points were listed most frequently: reserve, formality, or even snobbishness on the part of the Germans, which made it difficult to gain friends; materialism brought about by the comfortable standard of living, and the provincial, narrow-minded attitude of small-town (Marburg!) people, often expressed in extreme thriftiness, obstinacy or rudeness toward foreigners. Criticism appearing less frequently included conservatism, a tendency toward excessive generalization, and indifference to internal politics. One student suggested, "If you take the negative characteristics of Americans and enlarge them, you have the Germans." It must be said, on the other hand, that the same student made a somewhat more positive statement when confronted with the following question:

"What pleased you most in Germany with regard to (a) the country and (b) the people?" His comment was, "Potentially, the Germans are the nicest people in the world."

The bulk of our juniors seem to have been impressed, above all, by the beauty of the German landscape. The words "landscape" and "scenery" appeared again and again, followed closely by laudatory remarks concerning the unusual synthesis of traditional and modern ways and the abundance of cultural opportunities. Last, but not least, many students listed aspects associated with the German word "Gemütlichkeit": the ever-present possibility for hikes, the picturesque traditional folk costumes, and the "wonderful, unique city of Marburg."

Frequently the students characterized the people as friendly, understanding, hospitable, and willing to help. These qualities were complemented by remarks about the intelligence of the people, their diversity, their interest in worldwide affairs and in the field of culture. As one might expect, the word "industriousness" was not omitted from the list.

"Have you discovered that your appreciation of the United States has changed in any way?" Out of the three groups under investigation, only six students said that their appreciation of America had not changed, while three were unable to make up their minds. The remaining fifty-one added to their "yes" a variety of comments, and it is interesting to note that the students of Year II, almost unanimously, came to like the United States more during their stay in Germany: "There is no place like home." "America does have cultural greatness: authors, orchestras, painters, to be proud of." "Little things I took for granted I will now appreciate more." "We must simply be prouder of America, realizing ours is a superior society." "I'm much more aware of its influence and place in the world and proud and happy to be an American." A few students recognized America's role as a leading world power and some of them (academic year 1964-65) even devoted a sentence to the war in Vietnam, calling it an unavoidable responsibility of the United States.

The advantages of the American college were mentioned several times: the greater opportunities for closer contacts among students and teachers as well as for sports and extra-curricular activities. But the college was also contrasted with the greater liberty and higher scholastic standards of the German university.

The greatest number of skeptical comments was found in Year I: "I know now that America is not the world." "I realize how spoiled I am....America is a land of steaks, cars, and hot showers." "I finally have been forced to realize that not everything the US is doing is worthy of praise." In spite of these critical remarks, it is evident that most of the students--even in Year I--learned to appreciate and love their native country more than before. One student felt that he was now much more willing to defend his country because he so often heard it criticized. No matter whether the participants of the Study-Abroad Program became more appreciative or more critical of the United States, the following student comment certainly expresses what all of them may have realized: "I never knew how much American I really am."

II. Organizational Aspects of the Marburg Program

Thus far most of the issues under investigation in this report could be applied to the Millersville group as well as to other academic programs, even in other countries. The remaining questions of this questionnaire, on the other hand, were geared specifically to the Millersville Junior-Year-Program in Marburg[6]. They may, nevertheless, be of interest and value to institutions wishing to institute programs in Germany or other European countries, since many of the basic issues pertaining to undergraduate study abroad are of a similar nature.

This experimental evaluation is primarily concerned with finding the facts. Practical conclusions and workable guidelines for future study-abroad programs can be established only by incorporating the results of very extensive general research with the objectives pursued by the study-abroad programs of individual institutions. There is, nonetheless, one prerequisite of universal validity that our investigation shows to be applicable to every program, no matter what the findings of future research may be: participants must be selected with utmost care and caution. This axiom has been a commonplace principle for a long time, familiar also to the initiators of the Millersville Program in Marburg. However, like all programs sponsored by relatively small institutions, we initially faced a serious problem in the recruiting of students. There was no reputation at home or abroad that could be utilized in promoting the project. In order to institute the program, it was necessary to send approximately twenty students abroad. We succeeded in enrolling nineteen for 1963-64. Because of the rapid improvement in the qualifications of participants in subsequent years, we feel that no apology is needed for the admission of a few inadequately prepared students in Year I.

"Do you think members of the group were screened carefully enough according to (a) their academic abilities, (b) maturity, and (c) ability to live with a group?" That participants in Year I realized their own shortcomings, is evident from the following figures: ten answered "no" with regard to academic abilities (eight replied "yes"; one abstained), eleven answered "no" with regard to maturity (eight recorded "yes"). There was little doubt, however, about the participants' ability to live with a group: fourteen responded with a "yes," five with a "no." The opinions of Groups II and III about their own academic qualifications indicate a noteworthy improvement in the selection of students: twenty-seven of forty considered the screening to have been careful enough; thirteen disagreed. The problem of maturity remained a critical point throughout the three-year period, which may, in part, be explained by the relative youth of the American juniors. Only fourteen of the forty considered the students mature enough, while twenty-six did not concur with this view. Like Group I, Groups II and III found no major difficulties in living amicably with their fellow students: twenty-eight judged the other participants to be capable of living with the group, and only twelve did not share this opinion.

"How do you think students should be selected for a Junior-Year Program: (a) how much German should be required; (b) what grade average; (c) how much personal stability (and how can it be determined)?" The students' suggestions to these problems parallel the opinions of most educators. The majority of the juniors proposed a minimum of two, some as many as three or even four years of college German. Concerning the grade average, only a few considered an average of less than B acceptable; occasionally a C+ or an A was suggested. With regard to a suitable formula for determining the personal stability of applicants, our students proved to be as incapable of making feasible suggestions as were the administrators. Comments indicate that the participants themselves recognized this as the most vital criterion for the selection of students. Some of the recommendations included: "Accept students only after personal interviews," "careful study of their autobiography," "careful psychological testing," and "specific recommendations from professors."

"Did the honor system work?" Answers and comments to this question reveal that this issue is closely related to the students' maturity. Because of the lack of a campus and because of the general liberty our juniors enjoyed, the honor system was applicable only on tests and examinations. In Year I, there were eighteen positive replies and only one negative. In Year II the group was unanimous with a "yes" count of eighteen, whereas Group III recorded "yes" fifteen, and "no" seven times. In interpreting these results, one must take into consideration that many students (approximately fifty percent) had never previously experienced the implications of an honor system.[7] The comments, therefore, ranged from "splendid" to "childish" and included remarks like "unnecessary," "not for adults," "it was needed," and "it should be stated in the rules of the Program."

III. Travel and Its Impact

Among the questions dealing with specific aspects of the Millersville Program, one referred to the orientation period. We were especially interested in the students' reactions to the original plan of the curriculum which provided a second phase of the orientation program during the spring recess. From the very beginning, student opposition to a second orientation period had been quite strong. Shortly before the end of the first semester, Group I voiced its criticism in an open discussion with the resident director, and it was agreed not to confine our students to study halls while approximately ninety percent of the German students left for recreational purposes. Moreover, this six-week recess was the only available time for extended independent travel, a very important portion of the entire experience abroad. Consequently, the original plans were abandoned, but all three groups were asked:

"Do you think it good to have the entire orientation session in the fall in order to keep March and April free for independent travel?" Forty-six in all three years voted against, twelve in favor of an extra session in March and April.

The year in Germany included a number of compulsory field trips of varying length. Two of the long excursions scheduled in each of the three years were bus trips to the Harz Mountains and to Berlin. On the assumption that most participants would use their spring vacation to travel south and see the more scenic portions of Germany, a tour to northern Germany including Hamburg and Lübeck ~~-~~was planned in Years I and III. A shorter excursion took the students to the Rhine River.

"Do you think that the following trips should be included in future programs: (a) the Rhine River, (b) the Harz Mountains, (c) Berlin, and (d) northern Germany?" No one considered the trip to Berlin unnecessary, and only two students in the three groups suggested that the excursion to the Harz Mountains, highlighted by a visit to the frontier between the two Germanies, could be omitted in the future. The field trip to northern Germany, which in Year I was combined with the trip to Berlin, seems to have been the least successful. Forty of fifty-seven rated it worthwhile; bad weather and fatigue may have contributed to the unfavorable reaction of the other juniors. Since no obligatory tour of the north was scheduled in Year II, several students of this group saw no part of Germany north of the Harz Mountains--perhaps because it is not regarded as tourist country.

"What was the highlight of your independent travel (a) in Germany and (b) outside of Germany?" The most popular places within Germany were, in order of frequency, Munich, Berlin, Upper Bavaria, and the Black Forest. Twice mentioned were Heidelberg, the Alps, Hamburg, and the Rhine. Most of the cities recorded only once are in northern Germany.

Although we strongly advised our students to limit their wanderlust to German-speaking countries, many of them could not resist the urge to travel beyond the German, Austrian, and Swiss borders and to explore other European countries as well. It is, nevertheless, noteworthy that of all countries visited outside of Germany, a German-speaking country, Austria, holds the frequency record (thirteen), followed by Italy (twelve), and another German-speaking country, Switzerland (nine). France was mentioned eight times, Denmark four, and Spain three times. Holland, Yugoslavia, England, and Luxemburg were also listed, and two students reported that they had ventured as far afield as Greece and Russia.

"If you had to live in Europe, which would be the country of your choice?" An overwhelming majority of forty-eight favored Germany. Other countries mentioned were, in order of frequency, Switzerland, Austria, England, Holland, and Sweden.

"Which European people do you believe most closely related to the American people?" A majority of thirty-two chose the German people, followed by four who considered the English their closest kin, and by four others who voted for Scandinavian peoples; both the Swiss and Austrians were mentioned twice, the Italians once. Thirteen students were unable to arrive at a decision, and two generalized by saying "all north Europeans" and "young people in general."

IV. Health and Diet

One of the more critical issues concerning study-abroad programs is the problem of the students' health, which is, of course, affected by climate, environment, and food.

"How was your general health in comparison with your health at home?" Eleven reported that in Marburg they had been in better health than at home, thirty-five noticed no change, and thirteen observed a decline in their physical well-being. The following comments indicate some of the reasons: "lack of vitamin C, generally tired," "I smoked too much and my room was not heated well enough" (this student had a room in a private home for one semester and moved to a dormitory in the second semester), "frequently had a stomach ache which I had never experienced before." Three complained about extended colds and one about aggravated hay fever.

"Do you think the food in the Mensa is excellent, good, satisfactory, poor?" The results tabulated are "excellent" one, "good" twenty-eight, "satisfactory" twenty-nine, "poor" three. The Marburg Mensa serves lunch Monday through Saturday and supper Monday through Friday. It offers no breakfast at all, and it remains closed on Sunday. Students living in the dormitories have the opportunity of preparing their own meals in kitchenettes. A great majority (forty-seven) of all three groups took advantage of the kitchenette facilities every night rather than putting themselves to the inconvenience of a two-mile trip to the Mensa. Only eleven went to the Mensa for the evening meals, though not regularly.

The amount of money allotted to the students for daily meals was based on the very inexpensive Mensa prices (the equivalent of 28¢ to 35¢) and the cost of an average home-made student meal, such as native German students customarily prepare for themselves. When one looks at all three groups, it is evident that about fifty percent of the students-- the majority obviously men--found it necessary to supplement their weekly food allowance by private means. The amount of money used for additional food varied greatly with the appetite of the individual, but averaged about $ 2.50 per week.

Although the Mensa food does not offer the same variety of nutrients and vitamins as do American college cafeterias, German students, as a rule, are no more susceptible to disease than American students. Eating in the Mensa is an important experience for all native and foreign students in Germany; for administrators of a study-abroad program the Mensa prices provide an invaluable basis for calculating the cost of food, the largest single item in the budget. It is the low-cost Mensa food (subsidized by the state) which makes it possible for American students to receive a ten-month education and two-way transatlantic transportation for about the same amount of money as is required for the academic year at home.- One concluding remark: most students, especially girls, gained a good deal of weight, which they admitted was caused by their predilection for the pastry available in the numerous German Konditoreien.

V. Academic Aspects of the Program

"Is the quality and depth of the work required by the Program inferior to, the same as, or superior to the standards of your US college?" Because the word "depth" was omitted in Year I, only Years II and III seem to be relevant, although even here the students' interpretations of the words "quality" and "depth" apparently varied considerably. Of the forty persons questioned, six checked "inferior," twelve "the same as," and twenty-two "superior to." (Our students' great respect for most of their German professors or Junior-Year instructors is evinced in other sections of this study as well as in the students' semester reports.) For many of them the definition of "quality and depth" obviously depended greatly on the amount of specific assignments given to them by their instructors; the bulk of these "assignments," however, were in accord with the German university system, i.e., they were suggestions for independent study rather than requirements.

"Was the grading at Marburg easier, the same, or harder than at your home college?" Every educator knows the frustration resulting from the efforts to arrive at true justice in grading. The resident director of a study-abroad program is in an even worse predicament. He must find common criteria that can be applied by non-American university professors to American juniors coming from many different colleges. The most he can aim for under such circumstances is a grading policy that avoids undue harshness or leniency. In the years under consideration, the Millersville Program did not reach the desired balance: fifteen students found the grading at Marburg less stringent, twenty-one thought it to be the same, and twenty-two considered it stricter than that used at home. (Compare also the comments given on pp. 84 - 87 below.)

"Should any of the courses have been taught in English?" The answer of each of the three groups was a unanimous "no." The purpose in asking this question, which apparently disregarded the basic policy of the program, was to ascertain whether or not any student was so hopelessly lost as to be unable to follow the university lectures.[8]

"Did you have too much, too little, or just enough reading to do?" It cannot be established how much reading was actually assigned in the special Junior-Year courses; however, the recommended reading lists for university lectures are always of such length and diversity that no student had reason to complain of insufficient reading material. There were, nevertheless, nine who thought they should have had longer reading assignments; eight checked the "too much," and forty the "just enough." Those responding "too little" evidently had an insatiable intellectual appetite or did not attain the necessary degree of independence to locate and read the works suggested by their instructors.

"Do you believe that the curriculum--university lectures and special courses--should be limited to German, German history, German art and music, political science, and psychology?" There were thirteen "no's" in Year I, which indicates that in the first year of its operation the Junior-Year administration had (for the most part unknowingly) enrolled many students who were not majoring in German or related fields. In Years II and III there was a tie between "yes" and "no" replies. Those who answered "no," often needed other subjects, e.g. foreign languages other than German or geography in order to fulfill the requirements of their home colleges.

"*Do you think tutors should have been supplied for all university lectures*?" The answers (six "yes," fifty-one "no") with added comments seem to prove that the Program's policy of limiting tutors almost exclusively to only the first semester met with the students' approval.

"*According to the standards of your home college, are the credits you receive for the courses at Marburg well deserved*?" Some of the students were not at all sure. Five of them entered a question mark and made comments like "Some are and some are not," but fifty-one had no doubts that they deserved full academic credit for their work in Marburg. Only six voted "no"--among them four of Group I.

"*What do you think the better objective of a junior-year program*: (a) *study of Germany and the German language*; (b) *a liberal education*; (c) *a combination of both*?" Twenty voted in favor of Germany and the German language, one favored a liberal education, and thirty-nine were for a combination of the two.

"*Approximately how many hours per day did you study for your courses*?" Answers to this question vary so greatly that an attempted computation of a statistical mean would lead to irrelevant results. Individual differences in ability, diligence, and scholarship account for a span between one and seven hours per day.

"Do you think that a year of study at Marburg would be most valuable for a sophomore, a junior, or a post-graduate?" Experienced educators know that the best--though in most instances hypothetical--solution would be for a student to spend his junior year abroad followed later by a post-graduate year. Our students' opinion (sophomore year--twelve, junior year--fifty-one, and post-graduate--seven) showed a majority in favor of the junior year, which is, in spite of all objections, the most if not the only feasible year for many. A graduate year would, mainly because of the students' greater maturity, be more profitable to the individual; but undoubtedly the number of American students spending a year of study abroad would be reduced substantially if undergraduates were no longer admissible at European universities. (Compare also pp. 89-92.)

"Do you believe that a native German professor who has not spent at least a few years in the U.S. would be able to serve as resident director?" This phrasing was used only in Years I and II. Three students suggested that the crucial position of resident director could be filled by a native German without experience in the United States. Thirty-four, however, would endorse only an educator who fulfills the residence requirement stipulated in the question.

In Year III the same question was amended to cover not only native Germans with regard to their previous U.S. experience, but also native Americans with reference to their experience at German universities. The results showed again that our American students in their year in Germany had learned to appreciate the significance of the position of resident director: nineteen (against three) considered familiarity with the American scene essential for a native German, eighteen (against two, and three undecided) rated the experience at a German university as a necessity for the native American.

* * *

Up to this point, most questions in this report, however specific, are in some respects applicable to other programs, other universities, or even other countries. Many further issues of this questionnaire, on the other hand, deal with administrative aspects of the Millersville Junior-Year in Marburg, which may be of little or no interest to readers not thoroughly familiar with this specific study program. For the sake of completeness, however, and as possible suggestions for future research, some of the questions referring to aspects peculiar to the Marburg program are listed below without replies, evaluation, or interpretation:

"*Do you think that the organization of the Program prior to your departure from America was good, satisfactory, poor*?"

"*Do you think that the program in Germany itself was organized too much, just right, or too little*?"

"*Do you think that more personal counseling was needed*?"

"*Do you think that a woman was needed as an additional counselor*?"

"*List the university professors whose classes you attended in order of your preference*."

"*List the tutors in order of your preference*."

"*Rank the following instructors of Junior-Year special courses according to their teaching ability.*"

"*Rate these instructors' courses according to how much you enjoyed them.*"

"*Can you suggest any courses that you would have liked to be added to the curriculum?*"

FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

Approximately ten months after the Junior-Year students had returned to the United States, i.e. shortly before their graduation, the follow-up questionnaire was sent. Because of the voluntary nature of this project, we could not expect all students to return the questionnaire, especially since each of the twenty-eight questions required essay-type responses. Thirty-three of the sixty former juniors, i.e. fifty-five percent, returned the completed forms. The comments give a most interesting, sometimes surprising evaluation of the Junior-Year-in-Marburg Program, as the students, by virtue of being farther removed in both time and place, had obtained a new perspective on their Marburg experience. Since this kind of survey does not lend itself to a statistical computation of responses, it seemed advisable to explain, annotate, or rebut the students' comments. In some cases, practical suggestions and recommendations have been included.

"What were the main insights that you gained from your year abroad with reference to the foreign culture?"

Because of the diversity of the replies to this question, no prevailing trend in the thinking of the students is discernible. Common to many of the replies was the assertion that the participants in the Program, for the first time in their lives, had gained insights into a culture different from their own. A typical comment was, "My feelings are too varied. All 'insights' come from a total experience and enter a total relation. My 'insights' were in meeting people and thoughts I had not previously known." Another student wrote: "I was impressed by the 'depth' of the culture: the feeling of rootedness in the past, as well as adjustment to the present. The all-prevadingness (sic!) of the culture which makes it unique, but still part of the whole." The replies reflect a feeling of an appreciation that had grown and matured, but other comments revealed a lack of appreciation, as for example the following statement: "I will probably have to go to India or maybe southern Italy or Greece to really experience a 'foreign' feeling." Some of the students came to realize that the "culture" was but a narrow sector of the many-sided Old World, the extent of which had been beyond their knowledge.

Although the first question referred to European culture specifically, some students apparently were unable to resist the temptation of comparing it with American culture. The sweeping manner in which several of the former juniors denigrated American while praising European culture is no less than startling: "Germans seem to have less emphasis on materialism and put more value on beauty, the fine arts, the ties and links with the past, and tradition."--"I realized that Europeans, on the whole, are more culturally minded. They accept culture as a part of life and not something which is experienced perhaps once a year." One female student characterized America as the "land of blind conformists" and was of the opinion that the people in Germany had "better taste and a better upbringing." She was disappointed by the "increased American influence upon Germany."

In spite of a minority of such partial statements, it seems that most of the students, having achieved greater maturity, had learned to avoid generalizations and "to be cautious in judging other people as individuals and as nations." One student found the Germans to be "often cold people," but also reported that she had had more friends among them than among her contemporaries in the United States. A similar observation was cited by another former junior: "It was possible for me to adjust to a new way of life, and I developed a remarkable sympathy for the people with whom I lived."

Political problems were introduced in students' remarks as well as references to the American way of life; several former Marburgers noted their increased consciousness of international events and their greater tolerance toward "things that aren't American."

Statements indicating a way of thinking outside of the mainstream are of special interest: "I only got a taste of European culture and I now realize how restricted it was--only German." Another student characterized what he felt to be the trauma of present-day German society: "the tragic hiding and repression of inbred idealism and sensitivity (held together slightly by custom and habit) in favor of a safer quest after American-like success and a comfortable life in the new Deutschland."

"What were the main insights you gained from your year abroad with reference to your own culture?"

The question "Have you discovered that your appreciation of the United States has changed in any way?" which was asked prior to the students' departure from Germany (see p. 48), had obviously challenged the participants to come to the defense of the United States. Now, however, ten months after their return to America, there was a distinct tendency among them to degrade American culture in comparison with European culture. Some found American culture lagging "far behind that of Europe." Others expressed dissatisfaction with their present college atmosphere, which apparently had a rather depressing effect after the liberal way of life in Marburg: "....engulfing, stifling, and brimming over with complacency. Americans are complacent." An even more extreme view is contained in the following quotation: "Americans are naive. They are like children. They are usually largely uncultured."

The change in the majority of former Marburg juniors appears rather appalling if one compares their attitudes with those prevailing at the end of the year in Germany. Realizing that their views of their own culture had changed not only during their stay abroad but again since their return home, several students described the process that had taken place and noted observations like the following: "Not until I returned to America a little 'Germanized' did my culture affect me, and did I become surprised at those agreeable and disagreeable points which suddenly became magnified." Attempting to interpret the drastic changes in the students' attitudes, one may very likely find this the most plausible explanation: the nostalgia they felt for America at the end of the year abroad had now been replaced by a feeling of nostalgia for Europe. They again took for granted, and consequently underrated, the less formal way of life and the greater conveniences in the American civilization which they had missed during their stay in Marburg. Instead, the greater emphasis on culture that they had experienced in Europe had once more become the focal point in their thinking. "I honestly believe I would prefer to spend my years without the hustle, grab, cut-throat mediocrity of this culture." This was a typical statement, reflecting the attitude of a majority--an attitude which may in part have been based on self-deception. Only very few students still admitted appreciation of the foreign culture without negating the value of their own: "I have been able to step back and view my country through the eyes of a foreigner, to see us as the Germans see us. I can recognize now positive and negative aspects of my own culture because I now have a standard of comparison."

"_Did the students who stayed home gain anything of importance which you missed out on by going abroad_?"

As in their responses to the preceding questions, nearly all students were of the opinion that studying abroad had had considerable influence on their attitude not only toward American culture in general but specifically toward the atmosphere of their home colleges. They now felt superior to those who had not had a similar opportunity, and they discounted the few advantages which the students had experienced who had remained at home. "The cultural experience," one of them wrote, "makes anything seem less important that other students have learned or discovered last year." Some of the former juniors admitted quite frankly that the students at home had studied in a "smoother and more harmonious" manner or even that they "greatly increased their knowledge and familiarity with ideas and facts." They agreed, however, in their conclusion: they would never exchange places with them. The only completely negative reply to the question was made by a student who suffered a set-back in her grades because of a few basic courses that she had missed. The most positive statement again was overly enthusiastic: "If I would have had to spend my Junior-Year at home....I might have quit college because I could not have put up with this mediocrity for four years."

"What were the main insights that you gained from your year abroad with reference to your own personality?"

Although most of the returned students had lived in college dormitories before going to Europe, the year abroad was the first extended stay away from home for virtually all of them. Despite the rules and regulations of the Junior-Year Program, a greater degree of independence had been required of them in Marburg than had been the case in America. Since there is no campus at the German university, students had had to prepare many of their own meals, to choose their own means of transportation, and to create their own rhythm of daily life.

Some of them correctly observed that they grew more mature in this year simply because they grew a year older. All former juniors recognized, however, that the process of maturing was accelerated considerably by the unique experience of their year abroad. Several of the participants related proudly how they discovered their ability to "function alone." "Breaking away from the environmental rut" one of them considered the most notable achievement of the Marburg experience. A gain in self-assurance was emphasized by another. A few students even went so far as to assert that they had found themselves in Marburg. Poise, sophistication, tolerance, broad-mindedness, and non-conformity were the most frequently mentioned personal achievements.

All of these~~s~~ observations stressed the growth of personality and the maturing process, but only one student in all three groups found it possible to put into proper perspective and to overcome consciously the almost traumatic experience, which was obviously shared by all of them: "I found myself entranced by the new culture, wanting to assimilate it and shed the infamous 'ugly American' image. It became 'in' to be German, an ultimate goal. However, difficulties arose when I stepped back onto the shores of my own country. Without realizing what would eventually happen, I had gained a degree of hatred for everything typically American. Then cultural shock had hit. Only after months in the US and much serious thinking did I realize that the ideals a person sets for himself are not a part of a country, but rather a part of the individual."

"How has the year abroad influenced your relationship to your family?"

Less than half of the former Marburg juniors who returned the follow-up questionnaire had observed no significant change.

About four or five hesitantly reported an improvement in relations with their families, which sometimes occurred only after initial tensions had been overcome. About one-third described the atmosphere at home as less harmonious than before their year abroad. However, only a few of these students, well aware of their increased age and maturity, attributed the deterioration solely to their stay in Marburg. "My year in Marburg," one of them noted, "widened the gap. Now I have had contact with people, places, and ideas that my family has never known nor likely will ever know." This realization by a male student is somewhat in contrast to the remark of a female student: "The weekly letters to and from home have bound me closer to my family than ever before. However, the new impressions and insights gained into life....have caused a grave separation both religiously and culturally between us." Another girl found: "My opinions and views on issues have become more decisive and radical, where before I never had opinions. Of course, my opinions are contrary to those of my parents, but the basic relationship has not deteriorated." In those cases where deterioration was mentioned, it cannot always be traced to the students' more liberal attitude; sometimes the family simply grew weary of being incessantly exposed to enthusiastic praise of everything European and merciless criticism of everything American.

Often original differences between parents and children seem to have subsided in the course of the ten months after the student's homecoming: "The first few months were very strained because my parents wanted to but could not really share my experiences--I particularly had to re-adjust, and now we seem to get along better than ever. They accept me as an adult." Similar developments reported by other students justify the assumption that, in general, after a period of adjustment, the relationship between parents and students returned to normal or even improved.

"How has the year abroad influenced your relationship to your professors?"

On the whole, the effect of the year abroad on the educator-student relationship at the home college seems to have been quite healthy. Only a small minority reported no change, and most of those who did notice a shift saw it as a tendency on the part of the student to be more critical and ambitious. In virtually all cases the former juniors' self-confidence had increased to such a degree that they now felt prepared to present any question to their professors without inhibitions and also to question their teachers' statements or "fight it out with them." "Before last year," one student admitted, "I was actually scared of every professor I had." Another comment reads: "Now I feel competent to argue and disagree....before I seemed to hold back because of lack of confidence."

Occasionally, an increased respect for the teachers was evident: "I realize better how little I know and how much there is to learn." The comment of one student pointed to another positive result: "They now make me work harder and expect a lot more of me. They challenge my positions and I challenge theirs." This increasedexpectation in one case seems to have had a negative effect on the attitude of the student concerned: "Their [i.e. the teachers'] expectations completely isolated me from other students....the relationship was very difficult for a time, since I had to continually 'prove myself' and at times wasn't as good as they had hoped--they were unrealistic."

In only one instance did a student complain that the academic growth she had experienced in Marburg had had distinctly detrimental consequences. Resignedly she stated: "None [of my professors] are as good as Doctors.... [here follow some names of her Marburg professors]. This produces a lack of motivation on my part."[9]

"*How has the year abroad influenced your relationship to your fellow-students?*" (This question was presented to Group I only.)

The basic findings reported in the preceding paragraphs also apply to the relationship with fellow-students. Those who noted changes emphasized again their more mature attitude toward education and extra-curricular activities. No one used the word *responsibility*, but it is obvious that those who replied to this question recognized and assumed more responsibilities than ever before. Realizing that this new attitude of his might be misinterpreted by his fellow-students, one former Marburg junior wrote: "I must admit to a degree of status and aloofness. This is not to imply snobbery on my part, it is just that I seem to have different interests than others. My old friends are still friends." Readjusting to the American college campus atmosphere seemed to be more difficult for another student: "Trouble orienting at first. Then realizing the average

American student is still too busy socializing to really look around him." A similar feeling was displayed in the following remark: "....tend to associate with older students and students who do not display the typical shallowness of intelligence or of ambition...." The sense of responsibility alluded to above was reflected in this statement: "I am more particular about whom I choose as a friend. My friends should owe something to the world, not vice-versa."

"What influence did your stay abroad have on your liberal education?"

In their replies the returnees praised the Marburg experience so highly that their comments resemble eulogies. Extensive contact with students of other academic disciplines and the insatiable intellectual inquisitiveness of some of our juniors may account for their attitudes in this respect. Most of them seem to have understood for the first times in their lives the true meaning of a liberal education. A few apparently still misinterpreted the word "liberal" as a synonym of "unrestricted," which was seen in their criticism of the strictly regulated American college system. "After a year in Europe it became evident that my liberal arts college is not quite that liberal," was one of the comments. It was paralleled by another remark: "Last year was my liberal education."

Again the students asserted that the year in Marburg broadened their horizons immeasurably and gave them insights into a world of whose existence they had not previously known. "As far as academics are concerned, the courses I took were pretty much restricted," one of the former juniors commented and then continued, "The novelty of the experience and the new way of life have been incorporated in my liberal education." Similar thoughts were expressed by another student who called Marburg "....a unified experience, not a set of facts to be used. Therefore," he concluded, "the aim of a 'liberal' education was furthered."

There was much appreciation of the fact that the Junior-Year Program was not restricted to German language and literature, but offered courses in several other subjects in the general area of the humanities. As a result, most participants felt they had become more open-minded, more eager to learn and to acquire the ability to listen to the views of others. This, according to one student, enabled him to compare the culture of his own country with that of Germany.

Although the vast majority of all three groups expressed their appreciation of the opportunities for learning more about politics, geography, the fine arts, history, etc., there was an isolated case in which a student complained about a lack of diversity in the offerings of the Program: "I found I know relatively little or nothing about so many things because all of our courses were in the same field," he remarked. In all probability he was referring to the absence of the natural sciences in the curriculum, for humanities and related fields were well represented. Another participant had a completely different opinion about the restricted scope of subjects included in the Program: "More areas had continuity than ever before--much better than in America where one course and academic discipline seems blocked-off from the others." Still another junior in the same group found that her German friends were so well-versed in all academic areas that, by conversing with them, she learned enough to compensate for what she "never encountered at home."

The last two quotations seem to be indicative of the common experience of all students: "The year opened up my mind more than any other year--which, I suppose, is the purpose of liberal education"; and: "My entire 'Lebensphilosophie' was turned upside down--then readjusted and modified after I returned here."

"Make an attempt to characterize the academic atmosphere of the Marburg Program (in comparison to your home college, where possible)."

In making a general comparison between the two academic worlds, the students contrasted the highly scholarly climate at the German university with the somewhat more socially oriented atmosphere of the American college campus. They compared the intellectual freedom at the Universität with the principle of controlled studies at the American college. Many or most of the former Marburg juniors reported that they experienced a tremendous shock upon their return to their home colleges, a state of mind best exemplified by this statement: "Last year the world was opened up to me, but this year, upon my return, I had to face readjustment problems." While, as one female student put it, Marburg was "almost too unrestricted and individual but worthwhile for one year," her home college now offered "a 'pressure cooker' three-term atmosphere with over-emphasis on grades." After making a somewhat similar comment, one male student added a few words about student discussions at Marburg outside the classrooms and lecture halls which dealt with such areas as "....religion, philosophy, politics, etc., something which is almost totally lacking in American colleges and universities." One Junior-Year-Abroad student who attended a college with very high academic standards found that, in spite of the high scholarly and intellectual esteem in which her school was held, "....for the most part German students far surpassed [her] American fellow students in being students.... Here at [her] college [she] found the demands this year unnecessary and unbearable."

"*Characterize the university professors as scholars and teachers.*"

The nature of this question challenged the returnees to take a closer look at the academic environment in Marburg. Their responses were, therefore, more specific and more objective than those to the preceding questions. Their praise of the scholarship of the German professors was balanced by strong criticism of their qualities as educators. One student observed: "It is difficult to compare the *professors* at a German *university* and the *teachers* at a *small college* in America. Our 'professors' are probably better teachers, for the most part, but can hardly be considered 'scholars.' At an outstanding American university this would probably be a different story." The professor-student relationship was brought into the picture. While American professors were often believed to be more personal and more concerned, the greater respect enjoyed by the German professors was considered an impediment in the student-professor relationship. One former Marburger suggested that the professors should make themselves available more frequently for consultations and conferences, as "one does not usually approach a prof after class to ask a question."

Little or no doubt was expressed about the Marburg professor's scholarship. The students held them to be "far superior to American professors." "I found myself feeling a great deal more awe than for my American profs," one returnee admitted. Their preparation was termed "better," their knowledge of their field was called "wider, even more intellectual, their overall qualities far superior to those here." Only a minority of former juniors rated their American professors equal to the scholars at Philipps-University, and those who did so attended American colleges with a superior academic reputation.

According to the position they took in assessing the German professors, the American juniors must be divided into two major groups. One commended most Marburg professors as "excellent teachers," and another group saw the American college professors as better teachers, admitting, however, that small classes and a better professor-student ratio create a pedagogically more favorable atmosphere. Obviously, the students who refrained from criticizing the German professors in this respect, did not take into account that participants in the Junior Program were allowed to enroll only in classes whose professors had excellent reputations as both scholars and teachers. Critically inclined students seemed to judge the situation more realistically when they observed that the German university professor, unlike the American small college professor, is always a scholar but not necessarily a teacher.

"Characterize the Junior-Year professors as scholars and teachers."

As has been mentioned, the Marburg Program was designed to create a gradual transition from the controlled American educational system to the far more liberal arrangement of "akademische Freiheit" in Germany. Special courses, taught by especially well-qualified German instructors, were therefore made available to the American groups. In selecting these teachers, we took pains to choose only those who understood the problems of American students with a limited knowledge of German and who were, at the same time, true scholars, representative of a German university faculty. Little or no consideration was given to their academic position or rank. Some were Studienräte im Hochschuldienst (former high school teachers appointed to the university staff), others were young assistants to high-ranking professors, and others again, exceptionally talented graduate students. Even one department chairman and full professor of German served as special Junior-Year instructor.[10]

The students' comments on their special Junior-Year instructors range from relatively cautious remarks to somewhat exaggerated encomiums, as the following examples suggest:

"The Junior-Year instructors as a whole struck me much more favorably both as scholars and teachers. I know that I learned much more from them than I did from the regular professors."

"The instructors were more on the level of an American professor. As persons and teachers, all the instructors were very good and some of the most stimulating people I have met."

"The Junior-Year instructors were not only dedicated and well-versed but also made the material applicable for us. They were always well prepared for class and had something of value to say."

"All of the instructors were not only the best of teachers, but also living examples of the scholar who commands necessary facts and avenues of information, hardly equalled by the run-of-the-mill teacher."

Only a few comments on the Junior-Year instructors contained criticism: "At times they tended to 'teach down' to us too much," one superior student wrote, but then continued, "I found these professors nonetheless excellent." Another remark referred to the pedagogical style of these instructors: "It was basically German, and we had to get used to it first."

The general appreciation of the academic program expressed by all Marburg groups shows clearly that the students did become accustomed to German pedagogical methods, and that the Junior-Year instructors represented a vital link in the adjustment process; almost as important were the tutors who assisted the American groups in deriving full benefits from the university lectures.

"Evaluate the quality of the tutors."

Tutors were supplied for the major university lectures in which Junior-Year students were enrolled during their first Marburg semester. As a rule, these tutors were older students, recommended to the Program by professors in charge of the lectures. Most of them had previously worked with foreign students. In all three years, these tutors proved indispensable: without them, most American juniors could not have successfully participated in regular university lectures or seminars. This is underscored by the following student comments: "They were essentially and eminently capable for the most part." - "Very good and an excellent and necessary supplement to the lectures."- "The tutors show a remarkable grasp of their subject and an openness that was conducive to questions."

Among the most frequently registered criticisms was a tendency among one or two of the tutors to "get off the subject": "My one tutor spent more time covering material which was only remotely related to the main lecture than he did on clarifying or elaborating on points presented in the lecture." Three or four other students noted the same weakness in certain tutors, while two juniors complained about one tutor's negligence in attending the lecture he was assigned to discuss with the group. (This fault was corrected after the first year.)

Perhaps the most controversial question concerning the tutors was raised by one student when he stated: "They were very good, but they became a crutch. We relied too heavily upon them instead of the university professors." Since there is no doubt about the fact that tutors are crucial for the American juniors' understanding of the lectures and yet at the same time make these students dependent upon their special help, the tutorial system must be retained, but should in no case be extended beyond the first semester. After the first half of their stay abroad, the young Americansshould be required to become fully integrated into the German university system.

"Comment on the amount of work required."

With rare exceptions the former juniors reported that their work load in Marburg was, in general, lighter than that at their home colleges, but few rated this as a deficiency in the Marburg Program. Some admitted their satisfaction with the leisure that allowed them to seek more private enjoyment, while others welcomed the additional time available as an excellent opportunity for extensive study. Five students praised the absence of "busy work" in Marburg, in contrast to the common practice during their current senior year at home. An equal number of respondents indicated their appreciation of other advantages resulting from the lighter work load and were particularly grateful for the opportunity to follow their university professors' suggestions for independent reading and research.

To cite some of the more significant responses from the questionnaire: "The amount of work I found to be a very personal thing. It was up to the individual, and I personally gained a great deal from the academic freedom I was allowed." - "It is a relief not to have daily assignments, but only the most disciplined student will be able to keep up with the material." -

"I had extra time to pursue what interested me. Making good use of this required some adjusting at first, but it provided good training in personal academic development." One of the less gifted students confessed: "For those poorer students like me it seemed most difficult; sheer busy work for others, and still others used the assignments as jumping-off places for further accomplishment." And finally,"....[the relatively light work load] gives students a chance to find themselves. It also gives them a chance to show others, but also to prove to themselves, whether they are mature enough to accept responsibility."

"Comment on the depth of the work required."

It seems that the interpretation of this question differed greatly from one student to another, depending on the scholastic background and the intellectual qualifications of the individual. Obviously, some juniors made no distinction between "depth" and "amount," thereby largely invalidating their responses. Equally irrelevant were replies such as "A student must create his own depth," and other observations which failed to show any relationship between the work required by the instructor and that actually done by the student. All groups, however, recognized the superior scholastic level of the university lectures and most Junior-Year special courses. Some students realized that this high quality could frequently be attributed to the greater degree of specialization found among German professors. "Since the courses in Marburg (generally speaking) dealt with one writer or period, the work was deeper than the survey courses at my college," is a typical comment, and another one reads:

"How marvellous to look at the many aspects of a short period of time or a few weeks, rather than the survey-type course. The work we did encourages individual work and interest."

Some of the students who found words of great praise for the "depth" of the work at the university were, obviously, referring not so much to the work required of them as to the scholarly lectures presented to them. The small number of former juniors, however, who considered the work to be of insufficient depth indicated that their judgement was not entirely objective: even during their year in Marburg, the American system with its emphasis on scholarly achievement in the form of assignments satisfactorily done had still decisively influenced their thinking. Only superior former Marburg students recognized that the depth offered them in the university lectures should, to the best of each individual's capability, have been balanced by the profundity of the work accomplished, even if this work did not entail specific assignments. A comment containing constructive criticism deserves special consideration: "I would suggest more papers with specific emphasis on grammar, form, style, and research techniques. The additional work and time which would be required for such papers seems to be a very worthwhile investment which would help the American minors bridge the gap separating them from their German fellow-students."

"How did your grade average at Marburg compare with your previous grade average at your home college?"

A total of twenty-one students noted that their Marburg grades were lower than those they had received previously, five of these former juniors calling them "much lower." Only five participants of all three groups wrote that their grade average was higher during their year abroad (one called it "much higher"), and seven thought it to be about the same. Looking at these results by groups, one finds the greatest disappointment among the students in Year I: nine out of eleven were dissatisfied with their official Marburg record, one female student assessed her grades to be about the same as at home, and one young man noted that his average rose from 2.7 to 3.5. Of the eight students of Group II responding to the questioning, four observed that their marks in Marburg were lower, three judged them to have been about identical, while one mentioned a slight improvement. Students of Year III registered nine lower grade averages in Marburg against three unchanged and three improved.

"Comment on the grading system in Marburg."

A common complaint about the grading at Marburg was that the instructors considered the German grading system with its numbers from one to five to be the equivalent of American letter grades. One of the Americans stated, "If a Befriedigend (3) is a good mark in Germany--who wants a 'C' in the US?" Someone else remarked, "I know of several people who received '4's which were transferred as 'D's--a '4' in German is higher than our 'D'." Still another comment: "Impossible to get an

'A'--O.K. with me, but hard on the people who could speak good German."

Criticism of the Program's policy of equating German number grades with American letter grades is, generally speaking, unjustified: the two grading systems are basically exchangeable. In many cases the students' disapproval may reflect nothing more than the lenient grading practices of some American colleges, which make the more stringent handling of this matter in Germany appear much more austere than it actually is.

There was an approximately even division between those in agreement with the grading system in Marburg and those who found it too stringent. Only three students out of all three groups admitted that their grades in Marburg were too high in comparison with the standards at their home colleges. All three--and this may explain their reactions-- were top-ranking students. Several of those dissatisfied with their grades pointed out that the grading system "ruined" them or "messed up [their] chances for graduate school." There is definitely some validity in the following comment, which deserves special attention because it was made by a member of the less uniformly structured Group I: "How much knowledge a person has of German previous to his Marburg experience must be considered." This response reveals an awareness of the lack of uniform standards in the selection of students for this group. In reality it represents a criticism of the admission policy of the Program rather than of the grading system. The grading of the Junior-Year students was based on an equal scale for all participants without regard for their backgrounds and hence resulted in a wide range of grades, especially in Group I, the least homogeneous of all the three groups. Group II was of the most uniform composition and, accordingly, the responses showed an almost unanimous approval of the grading system. While the intellectual qualifications of the participants in Year III seemed to be about equal, female students were in the majority, which may account for greater grade consciousness. (Nine of the responses indicated that the former juniors considered their grades to be too low, one thought them too high, and only four were satisfied with their recorded grades.

"How are your grades in German this year?"

At the end of their senior year at their home institutions, nearly all returnees reported that their grades in German had reached a very high standing within the grade structure of their colleges. Since the question did notcall for a comparison of grades in German with those received in other subjects or with previous German grades, virtually all students simply listed their grades in German. Eight of the thirty-three who returned the questionnaire took no courses in German during their senior year; five of them, having already accumulated sufficient credits in German, were taking only required courses in other fields. A total of eighteen seniors recorded an "A" average in their German classes (including three "A's" awarded for student teaching). Three evaluated their work in German as "B," one, a psychology major, received "B's" in literature and "C's" in grammar, and three merely indicated an improvement in their grades in German.

"Compare your knowledge of German with that of your classmates who did not study abroad."

a) at the beginning of your senior year

With the exception of those who had no basis for comparison, all returnees observed a definite superiority in their language proficiency as well as in their knowledge of German culture and civilization. Occasional mention was also made of greater familiarity with German literature, but the emphasis was clearly on linguistic and cultural aspects. Some seem to have developed an attitude of superiority toward their classmates or even toward their instructors: "I command a vocabulary which gave me a lead of several years. More important, however, was my knowledge of German culture." - "Were it not for my Marburg background, I don't see how I would have been able to successfully accomplish student teaching." A student majoring in religion commented: "My knowledge of German was far superior to that of all others, including a German major who spent her junior year in Munich with another well-known program." And finally a comment by a future high school teacher, "My cooperation teacher's knowledge of German was atrocious. He even had a master's degree but had never studied abroad."

b) at the present time

One student declared himself unable to make a comparison. All others judged their command of the language even now to be far above that of their classmates. Eight, however, observed a gradual deterioration of their skills, and one expressed dissatisfaction with her speaking ability, which had "constantly diminished during the year and [was] now at a very low stage." Since this answer came from a student whose achievements in Marburg had always been outstanding, it should not be given undue attention. An observation noted by a non-German major is probably more typical of most other former juniors: "I still speak it in my dreams."

"Do you think your reached, and were able to retain, the level of proficiency you had hoped for?"

Twenty-one indicated at least some satisfaction with their achievements in the language, while eight registered discontent of various natures. Some seemed to have come to Germany with unrealistic hopes, others were unable to maintain the necessary energy to achieve their goals, and still others realized too late that they had been negligent about seeking contact with Germans.

The majority of all three groups felt that their accomplishments in the field of German language had been gratifying, but nearly all students included in their comments words of concern about the diminishing retention of the fluency achieved. This they attributed to a lack of practice or, as one student put it, a "dearth of those who can speak German on an intellectual level." Four of the eight who had hoped for greater proficiency as well as for better retention cited their own negligence as the primary factor responsible for their frustration. One senior who had been displeased by the low level

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST
AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

of proficiency he had attained abroad observed an increase of his knowledge of German after his return. Unfortunately, he did not offer an explanation for this rather unusual development.

"Would you recommend to a fellow student study abroad as an undergraduate or graduate, and why?"

Approaching the problem from the standpoint of maturity and language proficiency, many educators contend that a graduate year abroad is more effective than an undergraduate year abroad. They admit freely, however, that restricting studying abroad to graduates would deprive large numbers of American students of this valuable experience, since most graduates are compelled to earn a living as soon as possible after commencement day. Indeed, once a student completes his undergraduate education, his youthful enthusiasm for the unusual often dimishes rather rapidly and he believes he can no longer afford to spend a year away from the domestic scene. Consequently, if appreciable numbers of American students are to study abroad, a junior-year abroad remains the only practical solution to the problem. Even though this has long been established by educational authorities, it is none the less revealing to learn what those who have undergone the experience had to say on the issue at the time of their graduation.

About three-fourths of the former Marburg juniors explicitly endorsed the junior year as the best possible year for study abroad, but recommended an additional graduate year abroad. Only a few favored graduate study abroad alone. Typical comments are: "The experience of a year abroad serves as a unique general education which is of more benefit to the undergraduate than to the graduate, who has already begun to specialize in one area of his field." - "The junior year is ideal. The student has a change of pace from the American system of study, he is eager and willing to learn, in most cases."

The junior year was emphasized as the year during which students can profit most from the experience of a liberal education abroad and as an important step in the process of maturing. "Undergraduate studies play a major role in shaping your future," one returnee maintained. "The more diversified your education in the graduate years, the better it will be for your entire development." - Another student asserted: "In general, the sooner he goes, the better his chances of becoming fully integrated into the university life. We were just about the right age." One comment emphasized the necessity of becoming fluent in the language, which, the writer believed, could best be achieved by living in the country. The junior year, he said, would be a splendid introduction to the language and the culture, while a graduate year, after an intervening year at home, would enable the student to learn more of the fine points he might have missed as an undergraduate.

While several former Marburgers modified their statements by replying that the choice between undergraduate and post-graduate study abroad depended on the individual, three responses explicitly favored a graduate year abroad: "One is then the average age of the university student in Germany and has a broader educational background....For a junior, re-adjustment to American college life is extremely difficult and frustrating." -- "A graduate is ready for the independent study of a European university. Also, psychologically, a person who is, on the average, 23 or 24 years old, is more mature and capable of adjusting to the social demands of a student society in Europe."

The third student recommending study abroad for graduates only is a special case, since she majored in religion and found that she "missed out on many valuable courses." She conceded however, that it would be preferable for a German major to study abroad as an undergraduate rather than as a graduate.

Some of the comments of those who favored two years abroad are: "First of all, the junior year would prepare him by providing him with the facilities to gain a proficiency in the language of his choice and to grasp the fundamentals of his field (which would be next to impossible in a small college). After this introductory year and subsequent year at home, I feel the student should be mature enough (academically and emotionally) to undertake graduate study abroad." Two or three students pondered the possibility of a senior year in Germany followed by a year of graduate study. "This would solve many of our problems, especially for those of us who would like to return to Germany for further study and cannot afford it really at the moment." The other student favoring this kind of project concluded: "The fact that one only begins to scratch the surface in the junior year and must leave to complete one's studies, seems ridiculous." (It should perhaps be mentioned that these two students who suggested two years of study in Germany were young ladies who had become engaged to Germans during their year in Marburg. Both have meanwhile returned to Germany for an indefinite stay.)

"Do you intend to return to Germany? If so, what would be the purpose and desired length of stay?"

Of the thirty-three responses thirty-two were a defininte "yes"; the remaining student was undecided, but ironically, this young lady has, in the meantime, returned to Germany twice: once as a tourist and once as a graduate student. Seventeen expressed an intention to continue their education at a German university, two, a desire to teach at German schools; ten planned to go back as tourists; two hoped to obtain an overseas appointment with the army or as civilians. The desired length of stay varied so greatly (three months to indefinitely) that a computation would be irrelevant.

"What do you plan to do after graduation? Do your plans include graduate school?"

Thirty-one of the thirty-three returnees who responded to this survey indicated either a desire or a definite plan to attend graduate school. One male student seemed certain that his future plans would not include graduate school, and one expressed the desire to teach without mentioning graduate school. The plans of sixteen students involved teaching as well as further study. This number includes graduate assistantships but not Woodrow-Wilson or NDEA fellowships. Five specified that they were not in the field of German.[11] Obviously--this becomes apparent when one looks at the students' transcripts--several others who had not previously intended to major in German had now, because of their strength in this field, shifted to German.

"In looking back at the Program, do you feel that there were too many requirements and restrictions, or do you think they were necessary for the success of the year abroad?"

This question specifically asked for elaboration and most students complied. Twenty-seven of the thirty-three replies from all three groups generally approved of the requirements and restrictions imposed on the juniors while studying in Marburg. Two responses were irrelevant because the students had apparently not read the question carefully enough. Three former Marburgers made specific recommendations for changes in regard to requirements and restrictions, and one felt that "the Program was too restrictive in many respects."

Some of the favorable comments included: "We were not very restricted in the second semester, and those restrictions imposed on us in the beginning were necessary....only they can keep an American college student oriented." One student conceded that the limitations were not necessary for herself but "perhaps for the group as a whole." Others apparently had not noticed or refused to notice the pressure imposed upon them: they referred to "few" or even "no" requirements. In Group I two students felt that strict rules were quite necessary because the Program had newly been established, one of them commending the changes that "had to be made and were made" after the group had voiced its opinion. Among all three groups there were participants who expressed pride in their program as compared to others, also in regard to this matter. Its success, they realized, was due mainly to its careful organization. For this reason one former junior called the limitations "heaven-sent" and continued, "the other Americans grudgingly agreed our was the better program." As was to be expected, there were also some who admitted that they had felt restricted while they were abroad, but had since become convinced of the necessity of the directions that had existed.

Of the specific remarks, criticisms, or even complaints, several deserve attention. Two young men considered it unwise to require the entire group to live in dormitories (one of these critics had been expelled from his dormitory for not complying with house rules). Compulsory attendance in special courses, assignment of written semester reports, and obligatory participation in certain field trips were among the minor points of criticism. In the only really serious complaint a former Marburg junior first termed the Program "restrictive in many respects" and then concerned himself with the possibly most problematic aspect of the entire Marburg enterprise: its German-only rule. This student admitted having disregarded the rule after a few months: "It made communication difficult on the plane on which I am used to communicating. I'm probably a stinker for writing the following, but I will anyway: those that retained the rule had very little of significance to say anyway....I sacrificed perhaps a high proficiency in the German language for a sharing of experience and thoughts with my American friends...."

It has been emphasized above (see pp. 36f.) how important the "German-only" rule was in the pursuit of the Program's essential objectives. The great number of dissents tabulated indicates that in this respect the Program was not as successful as had been hoped. Among the students' most frequently cited excuses was their inability to converse with German contemporaries on the latters' level. Those abiding by the German-only rule--a 16% minority at first, which increased to 54% in Years II and III--were definitely sure of its significance. They underscored the administration's conviction that the rule is a sine qua non for any junior-year-abroad program that strives for excellence. The following quotation in support of the German-only rule went beyond the standing policy of our Program, but may well serve as an example for those student voices that expressed opposition to the attitude of their fellow juniors who found excuses for speaking English: "An enforcement of the Nur-Deutsch-Prinzip would have been quite beneficial. Not until they know they must speak German or leave, will most cooperate."

"On what basis should students be selected for the Marburg Program?"

Participants in the year at Marburg were selected after their records and references had been very carefully studied. Of major importance were evaluations made by their German teachers as well as general character references from teachers in other departments. All applicants were required to submit an autobiography with an appended statement of purpose and, if at all possible, they were interviewed personally. The admission requirements with regard to the student's character, maturity, scholastic aptitude, and proficiency in German, became more stringent each year. This gradual improvement was clearly reflected in the nature of the students' responses within the different groups.

The above question on student selection was subdivided into three parts:

a) "How should a student's proficiency in German be determined?"

Almost all members of Group I stressed the necessity of extensive tests, the results of which were to be considered together with recommendations and/or the records of personal interviews. The existing MLA tests were mentioned several times, the terms "standardized tests" and "battery of tests" were used in the same connection. All seemed to emphasize the necessity for a universal testing method, which would do justice to all applicants. Two students believed that the stress should be on reading comprehension tests as "spoken German is easy enough to learn once a person is in Germany." These two requests, however, were offset by those of two other former juniors (who obviously had had difficulty with the spoken language) suggesting more emphasis on the aural-oral part of the admission test. One student of this group made a recommendation, which was also mentioned by several participants of Groups II and III: disregard the applicant's current proficiency and test his ability to learn the language.

Though the author of this recommendation made no suggestions as to how a person's ability to learn a foreign language can be tested, modern psychology could probably offer a solution. Perhaps in the future psychological tests will be utilized in choosing American juniors for study at foreign universities. For the present, those in charge of admissions must rely on more conventional methods and, ultimately, on their own judgement. As one student in Group II stated, the applicant's "desire to learn the language and willingness to mix with the Germans" is one important criterion. To discover this "desire" and "willingness" through the student's autobiographical essay, a personal interview, and recommendations, is one of the most critical tasks of the director of admissions. The problems connected with the applicant's command of German are further illustrated through statements by members of Groups II and III: "I believe a person with little German background will do as well as someone with a wide background if he has general ability. His German professor's recommendation should be counted heavily." -- "Far more important than proficiency is a sincere interest in learning the language." -- "Paul L. did excellently in spite of never having spoken German before. I guess you have to base this on the college and its German department." And finally: "Some of the best students in our group were the ones who had absolutely no German proficiency at the beginning of the year....a candidate should be accepted if he is a conscientious person and can demonstrate high academic grades plus an earnest desire to learn the language."

It is noteworthy that suggestions emphasizing capability over previous proficiency were most frequently found in Groups II and III, while Group I commonly stressed the need of initial language skills. In Year III--an indication of improved admission standards--three complaints were directed against the enrollment of students whose German was fairly fluent at the time of filing their applications--students of German parentage or extraction. As these three critical statements were made by persons with a somewhat lower proficiency in the language, jealousy may have influenced their judgment.

Of all three groups, only two former Marburg juniors made reference to the basic prerequisite for all applicants: a minimum of two years of college German. One of the comments read: "Two years was enough, because of the brutal but efficient orientation--without that I would have never made it."

b) "How important do you think the grade average is?"

As was to be expected, many students in all three groups pointed out the difference in grading practices at the various American institutions. "The grade average is totally unimportant," one student of Year I wrote, "unless proofs are available which testify to the quality of instruction." Another former junior placed a "broad background, an awareness of history, politics, current events, and the arts above the grade-point average." Still another student (also of Group I) considered the grade-point average an important criterion (she was rather grade-conscious herself) because "good grades indicate that one has put out effort and....will probably want to keep this average up." In Groups II and III several students regarded the grade average as an important "starting-point" for selection, "as it is the best indication of the willingness to work." Generally, the former juniors in the latter two years placed more stress on the grade-point average than Group I had done. Various comments referred to the letter-grade requirement, e.g.: "Grade average in German must be important (at least B^+). I think overall average should be at least B-."[12] Or: "[Candidates] should carry at least a C average in all subjects but should have a B in German," or, "I did not have a B average but feel I did quite well," and finally, "....the overall picture must be considered. If a student's average is low because of math or science grades, for example, this should be taken into account."

c) "Can you suggest any way to judge personal stability, maturity, sincerity of purpose, and cooperativeness?"

All those responding realized the importance and difficulty of the problem involved in this question, and the majority of the suggestions made reverted to the conventional means employed in screening applicants for positions or scholarships abroad. Personal interviews were most frequently mentioned; autobiographical reports and letters of reference were recommended nearly as often. Many of these suggestions were modified in one way or another. "Character references," it was frequently stated, "should not be drawn just from the German department but rather from 'indifferent' sources." Another proposal was: letters of reference should be solicited from the deans of the colleges or even from the applicant's parents. Concerning the candidates' autobiographies, a number of responses emphasized the pertinence of a statement of purpose. Thus one former junior wrote, "I realize that out of the nineteen people in my group [i.e. Group I] all but maybe two had underlying motives for going to Germany." But he also admitted, "These did not necessarily interfere with their work." Personal interviews were not only recommended more frequently, but also discussed more elaborately than other suggestions. "The interviewer should be a good judge of character," was one of the comments, and another student proposed that "the interview should try to register the emotional response rather than the intellectual investigation." One former junior suggested that the interview be "more than a formality, but a thought-provoking experience."

To judge the qualities of applicants, two types of responses proposed ways that had not so far been employed by the admissions office of our Program. "Haveapsychiatrist evaluate the written statements of the applicants," one student requested, not realizing that the cost of such an evaluation would be prohibitive. The other suggestion (made by two returnees) was that the candidates' high school records be examined

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST
AVAILABLE AT TIME FILMED

together with their college dossiers: "The high school cumulative file would lead to clues about the student." One must counter that such an investigation of the applicant's past can easily lead to prejudices against a young individual whose personality may, in the process of maturing, have undergone rather drastic changes.

At the end of the questionnaire, studentswere given an opportunity to comment upon or to criticize any aspect of the Junior-Year Program. Their responses, originating chiefly from Year III, can be divided into eight general categories. Problems connected with student housing were mentioned most frequently, six timesin all. Questions of appropriate living quarters were followed closely by those pertaining to the curriculum, the German-only rule, and travel, each of which received five comments. Five former Marburg juniors limited their remarks to general praise of the Program, four made recommendations for future student selection, three suggested a liberalization of rules, and two made reference to the students' integration into the German host society.

Of the comments on student housing, three expressed dissatisfaction with the requirement that students live in dormitories. In two of these cases it was apparent that the underlying motive of the former juniors' criticism was discontent with dormitory rules. The third comment came from a young lady who considered the dormitory a "very ugly place for confinement." The three positive responses praised the dormitories because of the excellent opportunities they offer for meeting German students. "It was the one most important factor for my learning German last year," one former Marburger asserted. Another student modified her expression of satisfaction with dormitory life, suggesting that living in dormitories had been gratifying, but that the American juniors should be "spread out a little more."[13]

Two of the students questioned submitted ideas for possible solutions to the problem of group formation among American juniors. Such groups are, of course, the major cause for violations of the German-only rule. One of these students, a participant in Year I, proposed a reduction of the number of special Junior-Year courses. For reasons given above (see p. 43), this would be advisable only with an extraordinary student body and therefore remains hypothetical. The Junior-Year special courses are, at least in the first semester, the core of the Program's curriculum. The second comment came from a Group III student who suggested, "Perhaps if the students selected were more independent and individualistic instead of being typical conforming-type juniors such as found in high schools, those obnoxious American groups in the *Mensa* could be avoided."

All but one of the comments referring to student selection were to some extent connected with the *Nur-Deutsch-Prinzip*. Three of them explicitly urged the administration to exclude native or near-native speakers of German (in the three years under consideration, five students must be classified as such). In one statement, those who were fluent in German on arrival were accused of "undermining the whole group as they did not feel it necessary to put forth an effort." Another comment called their presence a "drawback" rather than a "benefit." They, above all, were accused of violating the German-only rule: "To those who found the language 'no challenge,' as they put it, it seemed logical to speak English." Two former juniors went so far as to request the expulsion of the notorious English-speakers. It is revealing to read the explanation given by one of the students frequently accused of this offense: "Some say that I often spoke too much English. This is not true. I feel you cannot force a student to speak German. He should be mature enough to know that his stay in Germany is that of a student, but not a tourist." (Compare also pp. 36f. and 95.)

Some suggestions concerning the curriculum requested what basically amounts to a more liberal handling of course selection. One student desired voluntary class attendance with the passing of exams as the only requirement, while another sought a broader participation of American students in university seminars during the first semester. Both of these suggestions merit attention, even though they could obviously be realized only if the group sent abroad fully met the ideal standards of an elite.

The fact that group travel was favorably mentioned as often as five times among these general and concluding considerations, points to the importance of this feature of a junior-year-abroad program. The organized trips to the Harz mountains and especially to Berlin evidently made a lasting impression on the students. They used adjectives like "excellent," "most memorable," and "most enjoyable." One student advised all future Marburg juniors to join, whenever possible, AStA (student union) sightseeing tours, because they afford, as a most welcome by-product, invaluable opportunities to make friends with German students.

Some former Marburg juniors concluded their remarks with a few words of thanks to the administration. They pointed to the better organization of the Program as compared to similar enterprises they knew of and recommended the retention of certain features as, for example, the low cost and the small number of participants. What had become apparent in the evaluative study undertaken at the end of the students' stay in Europe, could now, ten months later, be seen even more clearly: the former participants were enthusiastic about the unique experience of their Junior-Year-in-Marburg and fully realized that it had contributed decisively to their intellectual and personal growth.

[1] Stephen A. Freeman, Undergraduate Study Abroad, New York, Institute of International Education, 1964, pp. 5-6. (Dr. Freeman's concern has proved to be well founded. More and more programs have been established, particularly in European countries, and European universities, especially German universities, have taken steps to control this unhealthy development. At the University of Marburg, for example, there are now four Junior-Year programs, and the Akademisches Auslandsamt found it necessary to up-grade entrance requirements for American undergraduates seeking admission to the university. All of them now must have a B average in all subjects, not only in German. In addition, the written and oral language proficiency examination, formerly required of .individual students only, now applies to organized groups as well.)

[2] The t-test is a statistical procedure to determine the likelihood of the difference between two means occurring by chance.

[3] From here on the following terms will be used to designate the degree of significance found by the t-test:

significant	- occurring less than ten times out of a hundred by chance
very significant	- occurring less than five times out of a hundred by chance
extremely significant	- occurring less than once out of a hundred by chance.

[4] It is probably justified to assume that the same students who were so skeptical of Adenauer in 1965-66 have, in the meantime, modified their attitude, as have most Germans, with the broader perspective they have gained in the years after his death.

[5] This reputation has sometimes barred from the view of the observer the university's broad front of liberals, which counterbalances or even outweighs the conservative elements. This is evidenced in the responses of our Groups I and II to allegations made in a New York Times article of June 16, 1963, entitled "Marburg a Relic of Old Germany--University Town Bastion of Intellectual Conservatism." In a special questionnaire, fourteen of the New York Times correspondent's assertions were rephrased as questions and presented to the students at the end of their Marburg year. The results were indeed striking, as can be seen from the following selection: Of the thirty-three persons participating in the questioning, only eight agreed with the New York Times in considering Marburg a "stronghold of Germany's intellectual conservatism," twenty-one disagreed, and four were undecided. Concerning the university, all but four of our juniors (who had no opinion) were unanimous in rejecting the article's contention that in comparison with other German universities Marburg's "values and customs [are] at best outmoded," and with the exception of eight "undecided," both groups strongly opposed the statement that members of conservative fraternities with duelling scars, when strolling through the city, are "accompanied obviously by the prettiest girls in

town." Twenty-five of the American visitors did not agree that the Marburg students were "molded to a proper conservative pattern," as (according to the Times correspondent) a disillusioned former Marburg professor had stated. With thirty-one "no's" as against one "yes" and one "undecided" our juniors also repudiated the same professor's charge that in Marburg "a part of the country's future leaders deliberately shuns contact with modern ideas." In contrast to the New York Times article, which found that "Marburg has little significance as a center of scientific study" and that its "strong faculties are in German history and the German language," the student poll placed medicine far in the lead followed in this order by theology, law, philosophy, German, political science, mathematics, and languages. The view that "a survival of the Nazi spirit persists" in Marburg was shared by four of the young Americans; twenty-one responded with a "no," and six indicated that they were not sure. Several students pointed out that one professor had recently come under heavy attack because of his record in the Nazi era. Repeated mention was also made of the fact that Wolfgang Abendroth, well-known as a leading extreme-left liberal, holds a chair in Marburg's department of political science.

[6] Concerning the structure of the entire Millersville Program, see Günther Bicknese, "Akademische Programme für Undergraduates in Deutschland," The German Quarterly, November 1965, pp. 671-684.

[7] A question concerning the existence of an honor system at the participants' home colleges may be a worthwhile addition to future questionings.

[8] Some Junior-Year-Abroad programs actually include in their curriculum courses presented in English.

[9] In spite of this defeatist attitude, this young lady in the meantime has completed her master's degree in German with honors.

[10] An extremely rare combination of pedagogical talent and scholarly excellence account for this unique appointment.

[11] Each of these had clearly stated his intention not to major in German in his original application.

[12] See footnote 1 for the new requirements stipulated by the University of Marburg.

[13] Lest this comment be misinterpreted, the reader should know that the American students were distributed over the dormitories as evenly as feasible--an arrangement made by the dormitory administration as a matter of standing policy. However, because of the large number of American students in Marburg (from other programs as well as ours), clustering of Americans could not be completely avoided.

POOR ORIGINAL COPY - BEST AVAILABLE AT TIME